



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FUNCTIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ACT: II.¹

By E. B. TITCHENER

§5. We have now to set a new scene. For while the psychologist of function works, as we have shown, in a biological atmosphere, the psychologist of act, with whom we have next to deal, lives and moves in an atmosphere of logic or theory of knowledge. Functional psychology—so we might say, twisting Fechner's famous phrase—is a psychology from below, a psychology to which we work upward from the more fundamental science, and the psychology of act is a psychology from above, to which we work downward from the superior discipline of logic.

'Function,' Ladd remarks, is "a vague and sufficiently indefinite term,"² and the statement holds, unfortunately, of biology as well as of psychology. 'Act,' on the other hand, is a term which, whether it occur in logical or in psychological context, may be defined with some rigour. If we cannot frame a definition at the outset, the fault lies not with any ambiguity of 'act' itself, but with the multiplicity of contexts in which the technical term appears. We shall do best to proceed chronologically, and thus to obtain materials for a retrospective survey.—

The importance of the 'act' in modern psychology derives from the work of Brentano. And we may begin by quoting the sentences in which Brentano distinguishes psychical from physical phenomena.

"Every psychical phenomenon is characterized by what the scholastics of the Middle Age have termed the intentional (or, sometimes, mental) inexistence of an object, and what we (although the expressions are not wholly free from ambiguity) should term reference to a content, direction upon an object ('object' not meaning here a 'reality'), or immanent objectivity. All alike contain within them something as their object, though they do not all contain the object in the same way. In idea something is ideated, in judgment something is accepted or rejected, in love something is loved, in hate hated, in desire desired, and so on.

¹Continued from this JOURNAL, xxxii., 1921, 519 ff.

²*Philos. of Mind*, 1895, 300.

"This intentional inexistence is the exclusive property of psychical phenomena. No physical phenomenon shows anything like it. And we may accordingly define psychical phenomena by saying that they are phenomena which intentionally contain an object."³

Physical and psychical phenomena, the subject-matters of physics (in the widest sense) and of psychology, are thus differentiated by means of the character of intentional inexistence. Phenomena which 'intentionally contain an object,' are however in Brentano's terminology, 'acts';⁴ and psychical phenomena are consequently, one and all, 'psychical acts.'⁵ Their 'contents' are primarily physical (sensory and imaginal contents are, for Brentano, physical objects), and secondarily psychical, *i. e.*, other acts or unitary blends of other acts. The acts themselves fall into three irreducible classes, ideating, judging, loving-hating, which represent our ultimate 'modes of being conscious.'⁶ They stand, nevertheless, in the order given. By the tests of simplicity, independence and generality, ideation ranks before judgment, and judgment before loving-hating.

Brentano's special psychology was, as we know, never written.⁷

§6. Brentano claims, in support of his view of the psychical phenomenon, the testimony of a long series of psychologists, from Aristotle to Bain.⁸ His definition of the psychical act is,

³*PES*, 115 f.; cf. 127, 133, 238, 250, 255, 260, 313. I have called attention in this JOURNAL (xxxii, 1921, 112, note 14) to Brentano's change of view regarding the reality of the mental object. The preface to *Von der Klassifikation der psychischen Phänomene* (1911, iv) declares: "Eine der wichtigsten Neuerungen ist die, dass ich nicht mehr der Ansicht bin, dass eine psychische Beziehung jemals anderes als Reales zum Objekt haben könne;" cf. 149.

⁴The term *Akt* is a translation of the scholastic *actus*, which in turn is a translation of the Aristotelian *ἐνέργεια*. It is likely to carry a suggestion of activity, in the sense of 'voluntary acts,' 'acts of kindness,' etc. The reader may therefore be cautioned to take it strictly as defined by the writer who employs it. "Der Gedanke der Bethätigung muss schlechterdings ausgeschlossen bleiben," writes E. Husserl (*Logische Untersuchungen*, ii., 1901, 358), —and then, a few pages later, slips into the phrase 'psychische Bethätigung' (427).

It is strange that the 1910 edition of R. Eisler's *Wörterbuch der philos. Begriffe*, s. v. *Akt*, has nothing to say of the act-psychology.

⁵For *psychischer Act*, see *PES*, 132, 162, 188, 202, etc.; *Act des Bewusstseins*, 296; *Vorstellungsact*, 231, 347; *Act des Vorstellens*, 103, 230; *Gefühlsact*, 189; *Act des Interesses*, 263; *Act der Liebe*, 322, 330. I have not noted *Urtheilsact*: if it does not occur, that is only because *Urtheil* by itself is obviously an act-name. For infinitives, see *e. g.* 208, 261 (*Vorstellen*), 214, 262 (*Urtheilen*), 263, 314, 329, 350 (*Lieben und Hassen*).

⁶*Weise des Bewusstseins*, 266, 295, 345.

⁷Cf. our introductory discussion, this JOURNAL, xxxii, 1921, 108 ff. The new matter of the *Klassifikation* (131 ff.) shows clearly that Brentano had not in 1874 thought out, even summarily, the contents of his projected second volume.

⁸*PES*, 233 ff., 260.

however, challenged, and on substantially the same ground, by Meinong (1899) and Husserl (1901). These critics point out that the 'content' and the 'object' of act, which are identified by Brentano, must in fact be kept apart. When I perceive a house, for example, I most certainly am not ideating my sensory contents (Brentano's physical object). I am rather ideating, by and through these sensory contents, a transsubjective object, namely, the house in question. Brentano's concept of 'immanent objectivity' is therefore not adequate to a descriptive psychology.⁹

The effect of this criticism presently appears in the psychological writings of the Meinong school. Höfler (1897) remarks that, while a theory of knowledge must discriminate content and object, psychology, whose object is always immanent, may dispense with the distinction.¹⁰ But Witasek (1908) draws a less simple picture. Every elementary psychical phenomenon is now taken as twofold or two-sided, as at once act and content. There can be no act without content, and no content without act; the distinction is no more partitive than that of the colour and spread of a surface or the velocity and direction of a movement. Logically, however, the separation may be made, and psychologically—act and content are equally 'psychical'—separate treatment is, within limits, convenient.¹¹

The 'content' of a psychical phenomenon is the 'part' whereby it brings a determinate object to consciousness, and the 'act' is the 'part' which makes the object an object of perception or imagination or judgment. The essential character of the psychical, the character that marks it off from the physical, is accordingly this reference to a transsubjective object, a trans-eunt reference to something beyond itself. In Witasek's own words:

⁹A. Meinong, "Ueber Gegenstände höherer Ordnung und deren Verhältniss zur inneren Wahrnehmung," *Zeits. f. Psychol. u. Physiol. d. Sinnesorg.*, xxi., 1899, 185 ff.; E. Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen*, ii., 1901, 344 ff. (esp. 353), 396 ff., 694 ff. A little later comes T. Lipps, *Leitfaden der Psychologie*, 1903, 53 ff., 139 (1906, 5 ff.; 1909, 8 ff.): cf. also "Bewusstsein und Gegenstände," *Psychol. Untersuchungen*, 1905, 1 ff., and "Inhalt und Gegenstand: Psychologie und Logik," *Sitzungsber. d. kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1905, 511 ff. The general statement of the text applies more closely to Husserl than to Meinong, who still speaks of immanent objects. Husserl, of course, recognizes the limiting case in which object and content coincide (333, 337 f., 352, 363, 376, etc.). But it is not my purpose at this point to enter into details. Nor have I thought it worth while to try to carry the distinction of content and object further back. Höfler's claim ("Sind wir Psychologen?" in *Atti del V. Congresso Internazionale di Psicologia*, 1905, 327) will hardly hold water, in view of his own statements in the *Logik* (1890, 7) and the *Psychologie* (1897, 3): cf. Husserl, 470.

¹⁰A. Höfler, *Psychologie*, loc. cit.

¹¹S. Witasek, *Grundlinien der Psychologie*, 1908, 73 ff., 280 ff., 318 f.

"My ideating, my thinking, my feeling and my willing are always in their own peculiar way 'aimed' at something. I ideate *something*, a something that is not the ideating, perhaps a book; my thinking grasps things that are not themselves thinkings, indeed, that do not belong to the mind at all; it grasps them, without in any way drawing them into itself; there is, and there can be, no suggestion of a spatial relation; and yet my thinking 'seizes' those things. The same thing holds of feeling and of willing. A relation, truly, that would be mysterious, nay, inconceivable, if we were not so familiar with it from our inner experience! But it is altogether confined to the psychical. Examine the physical, search the world of material things, as carefully as you may, and you will find not a trace of it. You will find relations of space (inside, outside, alongside), you will find movement to and from, you will come upon all manner of relations: but this—this intrinsic reference to, direction upon, pointing toward something else—has no place among them. . . . Here, we may believe, is the most tangible, most characteristic difference between the two spheres."¹²

Psychical phenomena still form a class of their own, separate and distinct from physical phenomena. But for Brentano the psychical phenomenon is an act, in which a content or object (which is primarily physical) is intentionally contained. For Witasek the psychical phenomenon is an act-and-content, whose nature it is to point to some object (very often a physical object) that lies beyond it.¹³

The elementary phenomena of Witasek's system are, on the 'intellectual' side of mind, ideas and thoughts, and on the 'affective' side, feelings and desires.¹⁴ Brentano's loving-hating has thus been subdivided.

§7. At the same time that Meinong and Husserl criticize Brentano's definition of act, Münsterberg (1900) objects that the specified acts are not logically coordinate. Brentano, as we saw, gives priority to the act of ideation: "[all psychical phenomena] either are ideations or. . . . rest upon ideations as their basis."¹⁵ Münsterberg argues that this ideation is not an act at all. An act is an attitude of the subject, an attitude in which we say Yes or No to a presented object or content.¹⁶ Judgment, for example, covers the paired opposites of acceptance and rejection, affirmation and negation, and interest the paired opposites of loving and hating. But where is the activity, the Yeasaying or the Nay-saying, in the case of ideation? "We speak

¹²*Ibid.*, 3 f., 74.

¹³I am not quite sure of this interpretation. Witasek seems to say expressly (75) that the reference of the psychical phenomenon is an affair of act, and therefore not of content; and all the terms employed in the quotation just given are, as my rendering shows, names of act, and not of total psychical phenomenon. Yet the content is psychical (5, 74).—For the physical object, cf. *ibid.*, 6, 12, 73 f.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 81. Witasek's doctrine of processes and dispositions does not here concern us.

¹⁵*PES*, 111; cf. Höfler, *op. cit.*, 3 f.; Witasek, *op. cit.*, 97. Husserl's discussion (*op. cit.*, 399-463) will engage our attention later.

¹⁶H. Münsterberg, *Grundzüge der Psychologie*, i., 1900, 19 f.

of an Ideating," declares Brentano, "whenever something appears to us (*wo immer uns etwas erscheint*)."¹⁷ The implication is that we are brought indifferently, apathetically, into the ideational state, and in that event there can be no question of an 'act.'

Münsterberg would, undoubtedly, have urged the same objection against Witasek's system. For here, also, we find a recognition of the Yes-No attitude in all the elementary phenomena except ideation: in thought (affirmation and negation), in feeling (pleasantness and unpleasantness) and in desire (wanting and spurning).¹⁸ Witasek declines to give a formal definition of ideation, and contents himself with examples. He sums up his discussion, however, in the remark that ideas, the wholes of act-and content, are "so to say the psychical copies (*Bilder*) of the objects with which our consciousness is occupied."¹⁹ We need not press the language, but we get, again, the suggestion of indifference on the part of the subject. Moreover, Witasek asserts categorically that "the antithesis of Yes and No is altogether incommensurable with ideation."²⁰ In what sense, then,—so Münsterberg might have asked,—is ideation an 'act'?

The criticism is telling: but it hinges, of course, upon the definition of act. That is a matter to which we shall presently return. Meantime, it is interesting to note that the objection has been turned by a writer who could not admit its validity. It is turned by Stumpf, in his doctrine of 'psychical functions.'

§8. Stumpf finds that the 'immediately given' comprises three irreducibles: phenomena, by which name he denotes sensory and imaginal contents; psychical functions, which include such activities as perceiving, grouping, conceiving, desiring, willing; and the immanent relations between and among functions and phenomena.²¹ All functions (with the exception of the primitive function of perceiving) have, further, their specific correlates or contents,—forms, concepts, objectives, values,—

¹⁷*PES*, 261; cf. 106.

¹⁸*Op cit.*, 80, 280, 353.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 97 f.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 308; cf. *PES*, 291. This statement of Witasek's forbids us to read anything like selective attention into the phrases whereby he characterizes ideation: "[das] sich Präsentieren eines neuen Inhalts" (78), "[die] Vergegenwärtigung eines Gegenstandes" (98), etc. Attention, in fact, is treated both by Höfler (*op. cit.*, 263 ff.) and by Witasek (297 ff.) in the section devoted to Judgment. Stumpf originally followed the alternative road left open by Brentano and made attention a Feeling (*Tompsychol.*, i., 1883, 68; ii., 1890, 279). Brentano himself would apparently (*PES*, 263) have taken a like course.

²¹C. Stumpf, *Erscheinungen und psychische Funktionen*, 1907, 6 f.; *Zur Einteilung der Wissenschaften*, 1907, 5.

which Stumpf calls collectively formations.²² Phenomena, relations and formations, as objects of thought, give rise to the three neutral sciences of phenomenology, logology and eidology. These *Vorwissenschaften* taken together may, if we care so to apply the term, be named theory of knowledge.²³

We have passed over the psychical functions, which come to their rights in another way. Since relations are common both to functions and to phenomena, the 'immediately given' shows an intrinsic duality.²⁴ We are led by it, though not directly, to the distinction of psychology and natural science. Phenomena form the starting-point for both,—the logically necessary starting-point for natural science, the empirically necessary for psychology.²⁵ The proper subject-matter of psychology is, however, to be sought in the psychical functions.²⁶ Throughout our actual experience, these are continually and closely connected with phenomena.²⁷ Stumpf insists, nevertheless, that the connection is not logically necessary. Though every function must have a content, the content need not be phenomenal. Moreover, even as empirically conjoined, functions and phenomena are independent variables. Their assignment to different sciences is further justified by their radical difference; they have no single character in common, unless it be the character of time.²⁸

Psychical functions are also called acts, states, experiences.²⁹ Stumpf distinguishes, with Meinong and Husserl, between the content and the object of an act, but his distinction is differently worked out. An object is a conceptual formation. Hence an act that stands below the level of conception cannot have an object. In bare perceiving, for instance, we have phenomenal or relational contents, but no object. Conversely, when our thought is directed upon the universal as such, upon concept or law, content and object coincide; the content is, by its very nature, object. Between these limits stand all the cases in which we are occupied with a general or invariant (object) on the basis of a particular or variable (content).³⁰

²²*Gebilde psychischer Funktionen*: cf. *Erscheinungen*, 28 ff.; *Zur Einteilung*, 6 ff., 32 ff.

²³*Zur Einteilung*, 26, 32, 38, 40.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 6, 10.

²⁵So I interpret Stumpf. Cf. the definition of natural science, *ibid.*, 16, and the *notwendig*, *ibid.*, 6.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 20; *Erscheinungen*, 6, 39.

²⁷*Erscheinungen*, 7, 27, 38 f.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 11 f., 15.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 4 f.

³⁰*Zur Einteilung*, 6 ff. I hope that I here express correctly the relation of *das Zentrale*, *die Invariante* of the conceptual formation to its casual accompaniments. Cf. also *Erscheinungen*, 16 ff.

What, then, are the psychological functions? Without professing to make out a complete list, Stumpf distinguishes two great classes, the intellectual and the emotive, and names certain functions under both headings.³¹ On the intellectual side, the most primitive function is that of perceiving or remarking or taking note of: it includes the two modes of sensing and ideating.³² Another fundamental function of the intellectual life is comprehension or grouping (*Zusammenfassen*), whereby "a number of discriminated particular contents, impressions of touch, lines, tones, can be combined into a whole, a figure, a rhythm, a melody".³³ Next follows conception (*das begriffliche Denken, die Bildung von Allgemeinbegriffen*), and last in order stands judgment.³⁴ On the affective side we have such paired opposites as joy and sorrow, search and avoidance, willing and rejecting.³⁵

Here, where we have Münsterberg's objection in mind, we are especially interested in the primitive intellectual function of perceiving, which replaces the 'simple ideation' of Brentano's system. Perceiving or remarking is an intrinsically analytic, as comprehension is an intrinsically synthetic function.³⁶ From the standpoint of classification it would therefore be simplest to bracket these two functions together, and allow the opposition of analysis and synthesis to replace, in the ideational sphere, the Yes and No of the other functions. Stumpf himself seems to recognize such an opposition in the instance of conception.³⁷ Yet we are told that perceiving is 'most primitive,' so that it takes precedence of comprehension. Moreover, it is clear that the function has, by its nature as analytic, a negative as well as a positive implication of its own. While we are taking note of a part or attribute, while there is "an accumulation of consciousness over against"³⁸ this part or attribute, we are necessarily failing to take note of all the rest of the presented whole, from which consciousness to the same degree recedes or is withdrawn. "The barest act of attending or heeding," says Münsterberg, "is of itself an act of subjective evaluation, near akin to emotion, and fundamentally different from mere ideation."³⁹

³¹*Erscheinungen*, 5, 7.

³²*Ibid.*, 16.

³³*Ibid.*, 23.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 24 f.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 26 f.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 16 ff., 23.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 25. Yet it is noteworthy that the illustrative list (7) runs: "Zergliedern, Zusammenfassen, Bejahen und Verneinen, Begehren und Ablehnen," without a connecting *und* between the first two terms.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 17.

³⁹*Op. cit.*, 20.

We may, then, read into Stumpf's view of the intellectual functions either a primitive antithesis of preference and neglect, or a prejudgmental antithesis of combining and dividing. There still remains a difference between these and the remaining acts: since on the one hand the neglect implied in perceiving is, precisely, implied and not overt, and since on the other hand both combining and dividing are, so to say, positive activities. In so far, however, as 'ideation' has ceased to be the purely indifferent entertainment of a content or object, in so far Münsterberg's objection has been turned. And it is difficult to believe that the turning is a mere matter of chance.

Yet we must insist that Stumpf could not admit the validity of Münsterberg's criticism. For, in the first place, he attributes a duality like that which Münsterberg reserves for acts to certain classes of phenomena, namely to the affective sense (*Gefühlssinn*) and the sense of temperature. He speaks of the 'twosidedness' of these senses,—pleasure and pain, warmth and cold.⁴⁰ But if the 'twosidedness' here is an accident of biological organization, so might it also appear accidentally and sporadically among the functions. A second consideration is, however, more important. Stumpf, we remember, finds the psychological functions in the 'immediately given.' He does not find a 'subject' along with the functions, and he formally declines to base his psychology upon the *Ichbewusstsein*.⁴¹ But if the acts are by logical necessity two-faced, the necessity arises from their being acts of a subject.

§9. Let us see, then, if Münsterberg's requirement is met by a system which affirms the compresence of the subject, the 'I of consciousness,' in every conscious experience. Such a system is that of Lipps,⁴² which we proceed, briefly and partially,⁴³ to analyze.

⁴⁰C. Stumpf, "*Ueber Gefühlsempfindungen*," *Zeits. f. Psychol.*, xlv., 1907, 22; "*Apologie der Gefühlsempfindungen*," *ibid.*, lxxv., 1916, 3, 32.

⁴¹*Erscheinungen*, 8f.

⁴²Lipps' *Leitfaden* appeared in three editions (1903, 1906, 1909). The second edition, which is the most systematic of the three, is largely different from the first; and the third, which I here follow, differs in certain important respects from the second. Concurrently with these editions Lipps published memoirs and articles—expository, constructive, polemical—in which various phases of his system are worked out in greater detail (cf. the selected bibliography by G. Anschütz, *Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.*, xxxiv., 1915, 13). He was, indeed, continually revising and correcting, expanding and explicating, so that a later work is not only an improvement upon an earlier, but is also itself the starting-point of new insights and arguments. For this reason his psychology, as we shall see, never attained to systematic completion.

⁴³In particular, we are not here concerned with Lipps' views of explanatory psychology.

Psychology, Lipps tells us, is the science of consciousness and of the experiences of consciousness (*Bewusstseins-erlebnisse*).⁴⁴ The peculiar function of consciousness is to reach out, beyond itself, into a world transcendent to it; this "jumping over its own shadow," as Lipps put it, is the very essence of consciousness.⁴⁵ The experiences are of various kinds.

Lipps begins by differentiating sensations, as 'objective,' from all other conscious experiences, which are 'subjective' or experiences 'of me.' Sensation is the mere 'having' of a sensory 'content.' This 'having' is a 'running against' or 'happening upon' (*Widerfahrnis*); the sensation is a 'receptive experience,' the content of sensation is given only to the 'eye of sense.'⁴⁶

If now I turn my 'mind's eye' upon a content, I pass from receptive experience to an experience of 'activity.'⁴⁷ The term is technical: the experience of activity is a line or stretch of consciousness, which begins and ends with punctiform 'acts.'⁴⁸ In turning my mind's eye upon the content I start, so to say, with an act of 'hello!'; this act is drawn out into an activity of attention or apprehension (*Auffassung*); and the activity comes to an end, 'snaps to,' with an act which Lipps names the 'simple act of thought' (*den schlichten Denkart*), whereby I disengage an object 'for me' or 'over against me' from the original content 'in me.'⁴⁹

With the appearance of objects, consciousness becomes more complex. Not the 'eye of sense,' and not the 'mind's eye,' but the 'eye of intellect' (*das geistige Auge*) is henceforth in function.⁵⁰ I start with the simple act of thought, which is drawn out into the activity of 'apperception.'⁵¹ But apperception is of two

⁴⁴T. Lipps, *Leitfaden der Psychologie*, 1909, 1. The term *Bewusstseins-erlebnis* has not settled down to its final definition. (1) An *Inhalt* is not an *Erlebnis*, but an *Erlebtes* (3). But in 1906 (3, 355) *Inhalte* were *Erlebnisse*. So in the index of 1909 (391) they still figure as *eigenartige Bewusstseins-erlebnisse*. (2) In 1906 (8, 27) acts were *Erlebnisse*. In 1909 (21, 23) acts of thought are *Erlebnisse* only when their imaginal contents are adequate to the objects of thought, and acts of conation are never *Erlebnisse*, since we do not experience the objects upon which they bear. Yet the older mode of speech is sometimes retained (*e. g.*, 40). One does not see why acts (quite apart from the I-experience involved) should not be *Tun-erlebnisse* (cf. "Das Ich und die Gefühle," *Psychol. Untersuchungen*, i., 1907, 693): but Lipps was apparently on the track of a new distinction which he had not thoroughly worked out. Meantime we must accept contents, acts and experiences as in strictness irreducible.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 12.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 7, 16, 20, 23, 27.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 26.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 23; 14 f., 22, 25 f., 141 ff.; 13, 25; 9, 12, 13, 25 f.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 8, 13, 25.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 22, 25 f., 144 ff.

kinds: classifying and questioning. If it is of the classifying kind, I end it either by a simple act of 'fixation' of the intellectual eye, an act which constitutes my object a single, determinate, particular object; or else, passing beyond these acts of bare fixation, I bring it to a close by some act of comprehension, relation, abstraction.⁵² If apperception is of the questioning kind, a further complication arises. The objects which I question reply to me; they have their own status and their own laws, in virtue of which they lay their pretensions or claims before me. And I may just 'listen to' and experience these claims, or I may acknowledge them. If I acknowledge them, the activity terminates in an act of judgment. In this case there is a direct parallel between apprehension, with its terminal act of thought, and apperception, with its terminal act of acknowledgment.⁵³ If, on the other hand, I only listen to them, I have what Lipps calls an 'experience of claim' (*Forderungserlebnis*). This is a receptive experience, and therefore akin to the 'having' of a sensory content. It is a feeling of dispositional tendency, of compulsion or constraint.⁵⁴

The experience of claim plays a large part in Lipps' system. For the moment, however, we leave it aside, in order to characterize the 'acts.' These are punctiform 'doings' of the conscious I, and may occur either independently, as 'empty or naked' acts, or in connection, as the initial and final points of an activity. Lipps distinguishes various sorts of acts. There are acts of ideation (that is, of productive imagination), of thought, of conation, of judgment. 'Wishing,' for instance, is a naked act of conation. But since conation, whenever circumstances permit, extends from act to activity, we have acts which institute or inaugurate this activity, acts of impulsion, incitement, urge, and acts which round off the activity, acts of arriving, completing, succeeding.⁵⁵

The mention of conation brings us back to the *Forderungserlebnis*. Consciousness or the conscious I, whose essential nature we have seen to consist in self-transcendence, is also identified by Lipps with activity;⁵⁶ and activity is always an act of conation (*Streben*) expanded into a conscious stretch.⁵⁷ But conation is itself the 'subjectified experience of claim:' it is, so to say, the resultant of two sets of tendencies, the tendencies imposed on the 'I' by objects, and the tendencies, directions, pressures, needs, resident at the time in the 'I,' or it is a claim's

⁵²*Ibid.*, 26, 149 ff.

⁵³*Ibid.*, 26 f., 30; 11, 31; 32 f., 189 ff.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 31, 33, 34.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 21 f., 33; 22; 21, 22, 23, 32, 42, 263, 296.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 6, 39.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 23.

'effective resonance' within me. If the tendencies are in accord, the experience is that of active conation; if the imposed tendencies run counter to the resident, it is that of passive conation. In any case, conation and activity are definable as the interrelation or cooperation of an object, with its claim, and the individual consciousness.⁵⁸

If, however, consciousness is activity, what becomes of the 'receptive' experiences, and more especially of the 'having' of a sensory content? Lipps meets the difficulty by his doctrine of 'potential' activity. To 'have' a sensory content is to have it 'in my power.' I feel that I 'can,' if I so desire, turn toward it, direct upon it my activity of apprehension: or rather, since activity presupposes an object, that I can direct my apprehension upon the object implicitly or potentially contained in it. This distinction of actual and potential activity, though it is psychologically irreducible, is still a distinction within the general experience of activity, and thus guarantees the essential likeness of receptive and active experiences.⁵⁹

To round out this summary account, we must say a word of two further classes of conscious experience. The one of these comprises the feelings proper, the affective feelings, which are 'states (*Zuständlichkeiten*) of the I,' 'colorings' of the activity that is consciousness.⁶⁰ The other includes the experienced relations. The resolution of consciousness into a series of acts and activities does not destroy its unity and continuity. For the acts and activities bring with them experiences of conditioning and being conditioned, of dependence, of procession or issuance; in experiencing them, we also and at the same time have experiences of 'motivation,' that is, of their relation to other conscious experiences.⁶¹—

Not everything in this account rhymes or, as Lipps might say, 'snaps to;' the thought is not of the kind that can properly be reduced to tabular form. We have, however, gained a basis for our special question: are the acts and activities two-faced, positive and negative? The answer seems, without a doubt, to run in the affirmative, though there is no evidence that Lipps offers it as the formal answer to a question of doctrine.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 34 ff., 261 ff. Similarly in the acts of thought there is a "peculiar interrelation between the I and the objects," which makes the acts at once creative and receptive (21 f.).

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 14, 28 ff., 39.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 37 ff., 40, 314 ff.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 40 ff. In 1906 Lipps affirms that "just as conation and activity are an echo or a reflection of the claims [of objects] in the individual consciousness, so is the interconnection of conations and activities by motivation a reflection of the interconnection of claims" (29). This doctrine, and with it the reference to *Zusammenhang der Forderungen* in the index, have disappeared in 1909. Yet 1909, 300 repeats 1906, 266.

Conation, he says,—and we remember that conation is fundamental,—conation is “positive and negative, endeavor and resistance, wishing and wishing-not, willing and willing-not. The relation between the two is analogous to that between the consciousness of validity and the consciousness of invalidity, or between the positive and the negative judgment.”⁶² This passage recognizes the two-sidedness of activities (of activity or conation in general and of the activity of willing in particular),⁶³ of acts (wish and acknowledgment),⁶⁴ and of potential activities. For the consciousness of validity and invalidity belongs to the experience of claim, which is a receptive experience, like the having of a sensory content;⁶⁵ and this ‘having’ itself is a ‘having in my power’ to turn toward or to turn away from.⁶⁶ We may add that feeling, the ‘tingeing’ of our activity, shows the same dual nature; we find the antithesis of pleasant and unpleasant, large and small, familiar and strange, and so forth.⁶⁷

Everything, therefore, except the contents⁶⁸ and the experiences of motivation, has the Yes-No character which Münsterberg demands.

§10. We began this discussion with the pioneer work of Brentano, and we have used the criticisms of Meinong and Husserl and of Münsterberg as pegs upon which to hang an account of certain act-systems. We have thus been able to set forth, so far as is necessary for future comment and comparison, the systems of Witasek (as representative of Meinong’s school), of Stumpf and of Lipps. The central point upon which these psychologists agree is that consciousness is by its very nature intentional, that it transcends itself and refers to objects beyond

⁶²*Ibid.*, 260 (1906, 230; 1903, 203 f.). Lipps might have added to the negative judgment the negative perception and the negative recollection (201 ff., 212 ff.).

⁶³*Ibid.*, 301 ff.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, 36: Lipps speaks of a feeling “des Anerkennens oder Abweisens, des Fürwahr- oder Fälschhaltens.”

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, 31.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 13 f.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 37 f., 314, 329, 332, etc.

⁶⁸Lipps was not writing with Münsterberg in mind. For he compares the antithesis of pleasant-unpleasant with that of light-dark in the domain of color-contents (*ibid.*, 37, 314). The parallel is only casually drawn, but Lipps found it possible. In the account of the sensory contents (69 ff.) there is, of course, no hint of any *Gegensatz*.

it.⁶⁹ The word 'intentional,' however, reminds us that our survey is not yet complete. By the side of Meinong, Stumpf, and Lipps we must place a fourth writer,—one who is not a psychologist, one indeed who believes that there is a great gulf fixed between his own science and psychology,⁷⁰ but one who has, nevertheless, exerted a profound influence upon current psychological thought.

Stumpf reserves the term 'phenomenology' for the science that deals with sensory contents and the corresponding images. Husserl's phenomenology is neither this phenomenology of Stumpf's nor is it identical with what is sometimes called 'pure' psychology: it is something wider and deeper than either.⁷¹ All psychology, on Husserl's view,—and psychology includes for him the Stumpfian phenomenology,—presupposes the attitude of natural science; it is a science of fact, a psychophysics.⁷² There is, on the other hand, a science of 'pure' consciousness in the sense of consciousness freed from bodily entanglement and naturalistic presupposition:⁷³ a science that has to do, not with fact, but with 'essence' (*Wesen*).⁷⁴ This science, with its method of 'immanent inspection' or 'contemplation of essence' is phenomenology.⁷⁵ To enter upon it, we exchange the naive and

⁶⁹This statement must be judged in its context; were my intended book a history of contemporary psychology there would be much more to say. In a certain sense, for instance, Lipps is the direct antithesis of Brentano. At first, under the influence of Hume and Herbart, Lipps represented that 'psychologism' which Husserl attacks in the first part of his *Logische Untersuchungen*. Later he became a 'logician,' but a logicist of the dialectic stripe, connected through Herbart and Fichte with Plato. Brentano was never anything but Aristotelian.—Meinong, Stumpf and Husserl are all directly related to Brentano. But they, too, have made their changes. It is a far cry from the Husserl of the *Philosophie der Arithmetik* (1891) to the Husserl of the *reine Logik*.

⁷⁰E. Husserl, "Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie," *Jahrbuch f. Philos. und phänomen. Forschung*, i., 1913, 184: phenomenology is "von aller Psychologie durch Abgründe getrennt." Ten years before, the "rein deskriptive Analyse der Denkerlebnisse" which in psychology should precede explanatory or genetic endeavor is identified with phenomenological analysis ("Bericht über deutsche Schriften zur Logik," *Arch. f. system. Philos.*, ix., 1903, 114); and even in the *Ideen* (143, 159) a bridge is thrown across the abyss in the shape of an *eidetische Psychologie*. Messer ("Husserl's Phänomenologie in ihrem Verhältnis zur Psychologie," *Arch. f. d. ges. Psychol.*, xxii., 1912, 117 ff.; xxxii., 1914, 52 ff.) has done his best to placate the implacable.

⁷¹E. Husserl, "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos*, i., 1910, 315; *Ideen*, 5, 121, 290.

⁷²*Bericht*, 398, 400, 524 f.; *Philosophie*, 298 f., 302, 315; *Ideen*, 3 f., 8, 69 f. cf. O. Külpe, *Vorlesungen über Psychologie*, 1920, 22.

⁷³*Philosophie*, 302, 315; *Ideen*, 57 ff., 94, 121 f.

⁷⁴*Log. Untersuchungen*, ii., 18 f.; *Philosophie*, 314 ff.; *Ideen*, 4, 7 ff., 114.

⁷⁵"Immanentes Schauen." *Philosophie*, 303, 313; "Wesenserschauung." *Ideen*, 11, 43; "Wesensschauung." *Philosophie*, 315 f. Cf. *Ideen*, 113.

dogmatic attitude of every day life and of natural science for a 'philosophical' attitude, which leaves visible only 'pure' consciousness in its 'absolute intrinsicality.'⁷⁶ And if we should rashly venture to transfer to the domain of descriptive psychology some result of the phenomenological scrutiny of essence, the responsibility is ours alone; Husserl washes his hands of us.⁷⁷

Psychology, then, is the empirical science of mental facts as physics is the empirical science of material facts.⁷⁸ Psychology is concerned with 'experiences,' physical science with the 'non-experiences' to which experiences refer, with the 'intended objects' of acts.⁷⁹ And since natural science recognizes the individuation of organic life, these experiences are the experiences of an 'I.'⁸⁰ Consciousness, in the wide sense, therefore embraces the entire phenomenological make-up of the mental 'I,' or consciousness is the phenomenological 'I' as 'bundle' or complication of psychical experiences.⁸¹ In a narrower and 'pregnant' sense, consciousness is the inclusive name for intentional experiences or acts.⁸²

The 'act,' it will be noted, is here identified with the complete intentional experience,⁸³ which includes both the 'content' (upon which the 'object' is based) and the 'intention' or 'act-character.'⁸⁴ Since, however, contents (in this narrower sense) are

⁷⁶*Philosophie*, 302, 315; *Ideen*, 3, 46 ff., 48 ff., 94, 120 ff., 182 f.

⁷⁷The thing can be done (*Bericht*, 400; *Philosophie*, 315; *Ideen*, 143), and on Husserl's own showing the psychologist has no choice but to make the attempt. It seems, however, that every psychologist who has so far ventured (even the well-intentioned Messer) has flatly failed. Happily for us, such failure does not greatly matter. We are interested in Husserl, less for his own sake, than for the way in which psychologists have understood him.

⁷⁸*Bericht*, 398.

⁷⁹*Log. Untersuchungen*, ii., 338 f.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 336; *Bericht*, 399 f., 524 f.; *Philosophie*, 298, 312 f.; *Ideen*, 104.

⁸¹*Log. Untersuchungen*, ii., 325 ff., 350, 354 f.; *Ideen*, 65, 168 ff. (esp. 172). Stumpf's phenomenology, which we have accounted a part of Husserl's psychology, has its phenomenological counterpart in a phenomenological hyletics; and this, directly translated into psychological terms, becomes a chapter of eidetic psychology (*Ideen*, 178 f.). But Stumpf is an interactionist, and would hardly rule out psychophysics ("Eröffnungsrede," *Dritter internat. Congress f. Psychol.*, 1897, 7 ff.).

Husserl's emphasis upon inference (*Log. Unt.*, 331, 339) has led Wundt ("Psychologismus und Logizismus," *Kleine Schriften*, i., 1910, 570 ff.) to criticize him from the side of the 'unconscious.' For our immediate purpose this criticism is irrelevant.

⁸²*Log. Unt.*, ii., 342, 345, 349; *Ideen*, 168, 174 f. Husserl's terminology has changed in the *Ideen*: for 'act' see *ib.*, 170.

⁸³So, e. g., *Log. Unt.*, ii., 323, 357, 362, 388; cf. A. Messer, *Empfindung und Denken*, 1908, 43.

⁸⁴For the "primary contents" see *Log. Unt.*, ii., 652 (cf. 330, 345, 349, 360, 364 n., 370 ff., 468, 471); *Ideen*, 172. For the 'basing' of the object, *Log. Unt.*, ii., 353, 361, 362, 363, 370, 393, etc. For 'intention,' *ibid.*, 323, 348, 357 f., 361, etc.

themselves non-intentional experiences, we may use the term 'act' in contradistinction to content for the act-character alone.⁸⁵ Acts, in this specialized meaning, lack intensity, but show differences of quality and material. These moments, though inseparable, are independently variable.⁸⁶ Quality is that which marks an act as an act of ideation or judgment or question or doubt or wish.⁸⁷ Material is the specific direction of an act upon its object. Thus I may apprehend a given geometrical figure now as an equilateral and now as an equiangular triangle. Here the objects are the same; the contents are the same; the act-qualities are the same; but the act-materials are different. That is to say, the material of an act determines not only what object is apprehended, but also as what (with what attributes, forms, relations) the apprehended object is taken.⁸⁸

Within this analytical framework Husserl seeks specifically to test the validity of Brentano's law,—the law to which we have found Münsterberg raising formal objection: namely, that all psychical phenomena either are ideations or rest upon ideations as their basis.⁸⁹ Husserl is able to show that Brentano's formula involves an equivocation. Translated provisionally into his own terms the law would run: every intentional experience either is an ideation (*i. e.*, a bare or simple ideation) or has an ideation as its basis; but here the 'ideation' of the first clause means an act-quality, and the 'ideation' of the second clause an act-material.⁹⁰ Husserl accordingly enters upon an elaborate analysis of the term 'ideation,' which he equates, in its very widest sense, with the term 'act of objectification.'⁹¹ The new genus may be differentiated, qualitatively, into thetical and athetical acts of objectification: the former being the acts of 'belief' in the sense of J. S. Mill or of 'judgment' in the sense of Brentano, and the latter being the corresponding acts of 'simple ideation;' and, materially, into propositional and nominal acts ("Columbus discovered Amer-

⁸⁵Husserl himself speaks of the intentional content (*Log. Unt.*, ii, 375, 378, 386 ff.) and of the intentionality of the act (392 ff.). It is, however, hardly possible, in any extended discussion, to avoid the narrower use of the term: cf. Messer, *Empfindung und Denken*, 45, 47, 74.

⁸⁶*Log. Unt.*, ii, 374, 386 ff., 391. Cf. 566.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 386, f.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, 389 f.; for a broader definition, cf. 462. In the *Ideen* the terminology has again changed: see esp. 267 f. Here and in *Bericht*, 244 the distinction of quality and material is ascribed to Brentano: I suppose the reference is to the distinction of quality (affirmation, negation) and *Sinn* in Brentano's doctrine of the judgment (*PES*, 283, 303).

⁸⁹See above, note 15.

⁹⁰*Log. Unt.*, ii, 428 f.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, 447: cf. 449, 458 ff.

ica," "Columbus, the discoverer of America").⁹² Brentano's law may now be rewritten in the form: every intentional experience either is an act of objectification or has such an act as its basis; so phrased, the formula is valid.⁹³ The important thing for Husserl is, no doubt, that he has thus thought himself clear. The important things for us are that, by keeping his discussion at the phenomenological level, he has avoided all reference to the attitude of an 'I', whether empirical or pure,⁹⁴ and that with 'act of objectification' he has introduced a term which seems destined to play a large part in empirical psychology.⁹⁵

§11. Husserl's influence may, indeed, be traced all through the later and more characteristic work of the Würzburg school. How deeply it had affected the psychology of Külpe himself, we shall probably never know. We have, however, a *Psychologie* from the hand of Messer, a member of the school, whose thinking has been largely shaped by Erdmann, Husserl and Külpe.⁹⁶ This book, in default of the promised recasting of Külpe's *Grundriss*, must now engage our attention.

Messer offers three characterizations of the conscious or psychical. He accepts from Münsterberg the formula that physical is shareable, psychical unshareable experience; he accepts from Lipps the view that the psychical always is, while the physical is not, in some sense 'mine;' and he accepts from Husserl the distinction of the psychical as immanent from the

⁹²*Ibid.*, 449 f. In the *Ideen* (235) the terms 'thetical' and 'athetical' are replaced by the broader terms 'positional' and 'neutral', with consequences that do not immediately concern us.

⁹³*Log. Unt.*, ii., 458. The second clause may also be paraphrased: "or necessarily includes as constituent an act of objectification whose total material is at the same time—and in the sense of individual identity—its total material."

⁹⁴In the *Log. Unt.* (340 ff.) the 'pure I' is phenomenologically discredited. In the *Ideen* (109 f.) it comes back, but the consequences again do not immediately concern us. Only, the cutting of Münsterberg's difficulty, in the *Log. Unt.*, would appear to have been premature.

⁹⁵As in Dürr's edition of Ebbinghaus' *Psychologie*, 1911-13.

⁹⁶Messer published in 1908 a little book entitled *Empfindung und Denken*, which bears Husserl's impress on nearly every page. Its main effect upon the reader's mind is a sheer wonder that two things so incompatible as sensation and thinking can lie down together between the same covers. The *Psychologie* of 1914 has the more empirical flavor of the Würzburg school.

Külpe's posthumous work, *Vorlesungen über Psychologie* (ed. K. Bühler, 1920) is utterly inadequate on the side of its author's system. It does not either show Külpe at his best; much of the writing is the work of a jaded and driven man. In any case, Külpe may have been less nearly ready than we supposed. Bühler's preface ends with the (to me surprising) statement: "Ueber den Willen und das Denken hat Külpe nicht gelesen und leider auch keinerlei Aufzeichnungen hintergelassen."

physical as transcendent.⁹⁷ We may pass over Münsterberg and Lipps,⁹⁸ and come at once to Messer's interpretation of Husserl. Since the transcendence which characterizes the physical is a transcendence of consciousness, it follows of necessity that some psychical must, for Messer, take the form of 'consciousness of.' As a matter of fact, Messer declares roundly that all consciousness is consciousness-of, *Gegenstandsbewusstsein*, though certain elements of consciousness, taken in isolation from their regular setting, lack intentionality.⁹⁹

The experiences (*Erlebnisse*), which make up the subject-matter of psychology may be divided into those of knowing, feeling and willing.¹⁰⁰ We may also speak of consciousness of objects (in a narrower sense), consciousness of state, and consciousness of cause.¹⁰¹ The elements of these experiences are classified as palpable or impalpable, according as they stand up

⁹⁷A. Messer, *Psychologie*, 27 f., 32 f.; cf. 55, 73, 127 f., 138, 146. Messer is here speaking of *das bewusst Psychische*. Whether there are also *unbewusst psychische Vorgänge* is a question that he leaves open, though he inclines to answer it affirmatively: 35 ff., 251 ff., 365 f.

⁹⁸For Münsterberg's position, see *Grundzüge*, i., 1900, 72. The Lippsian 'mine' does not mean for Messer the constant and overt presence in consciousness of 'my I itself,' the I-character or relation of 'mine' is often represented solely by the unitariness and blendedness of experiences: *Psychol.*, 27.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, 66, 53. The sweeping statement, as always, brings its difficulties. Messer admits, *e. g.*, that conscious complexes (fusions of pleasant feeling with sexual sensations, fusions of unpleasant feeling with sensations of pain) may occur without reference to an object (307). Such complexes are obviously far removed from the status of conscious elements; and pain, at any rate, may be so overwhelmingly itself as to drive away all competitors of the referential kind.

There is difficulty, moreover, in connection with Messer's whole doctrine of emotion (*Affekt*). In *Psychol.*, 52 feelings and emotions (apparently, all feelings and all emotions) are intentional. But the simple feelings of pleasantness and unpleasantness are positively not intentional (302), and emotions are only strong and sudden feelings (293). I find, indeed, no reference to affective intentionality in the pages that deal in detail with emotion and its classification. A feeling may, however, carry intentional reference in its own right,—in which case it is no longer a bare pleasantness or unpleasantness, but a *Wertgefühl* or affective evaluation (303). Hence in a later list we find no mention of "feelings, emotions," but only of "experiences of evaluation and will," as intrinsically intentional (374; cf. 52). In general it seems that Messer recognizes three levels of emotive process: (1) a fusion of feeling with sensations, wholly without objective reference; (2) a fusion of feeling with acts of the consciousness of objects (in the narrower sense), *i. e.*, a complex in which the feeling is not intentional but the basal ideation carries objective reference; and (3) a fusion of affective evaluation with ideation, a complex in which both principal factors carry reference (cf. 66). How these types are to be fitted to his definition of consciousness is not easy to see.

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 65.

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, 66. This classification is borrowed from J. Rehmke, *Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Psychologie*, 1894, 148 f.

under observation or as they refuse to be observed and must accordingly be recovered through reflection.¹⁰² Of the palpable elements, sensations belong to all three types of consciousness.¹⁰³ Knowing, or the consciousness of objects, includes further, as palpable elements, the images which correspond with sensations, temporal and spatial contents, and the impressions (of 'same,' 'like,' 'different,' etc.) which lie at the basis of general concepts.¹⁰⁴ Whether consciousness of state and consciousness of cause embrace palpable elements of a specific (non-sensational) sort is difficult to say: Messer's statements are conflicting. It seems that the simple feelings are, as a class, impalpable, though in exceptional cases they will bear scrutiny.¹⁰⁵ Conation, too, while it is intentional and should therefore by rights be impalpable, may, on occasion—if it is aroused involuntarily, and especially if it is directed upon objects of sense-perception—be observed during its course.¹⁰⁶

The term 'act' is used by Messer in two senses: first, for the whole of an intentional experience, and secondly for the act-side or act-character of such an experience.¹⁰⁷ In the first sense, acts are called palpable or impalpable according as their intended object is or is not represented by sensations and images.¹⁰⁸ In the second sense, in which the acts are conscious elements

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, 48, 74, 202; *Empfindung und Denken*, 78 f. I suggest 'palpable' and 'impalpable' as the English equivalents of *anschaulich* and *unanschaulich*: cf. 'Macbeth,' II, i., 40.

¹⁰³*Psychol.*, 66, 74 f.

¹⁰⁴Messer recognizes peripherally excited and centrally excited (or reproduced) sensations in primary and secondary (synaesthetic) form: *Psychol.*, 127 ff. For space and time as contents, see *ibid.*, 149, 155, 175 f., 202. It is expressly said that space is not an attribute of sensation, like quality and intensity (149); and time is so far from being an attribute of anything that it may, in Messer's opinion, be experienced for itself, as empty time (176). Yet we are told later that feelings share with sensations the attributes of intensity, quality, and the "extensives Merkmal" of temporal duration, while they lack the "räumliches Charakter" that attaches to all sensations (280)! For the palpable impressions underlying concepts, see *ibid.*, 180 ff.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, 48: feelings that are closely connected with sensations and that possess a 'peripheral' character are palpable. But sensations are defined differentially as palpable (74); and feelings are impalpable (278 f., 346). Husserl (*Log. Unt.*, ii., 369 ff.) and Stumpf recognize a class of affective sensations, and thus meet the difficulty. In *Empf. und Denken*, 23, Messer takes the same view: *cf. Psychol.*, 276.

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, 48. But all *Streben* is involuntary (312)! Moreover, the later distinction seems to be, not that of peripherally and centrally directed conations, but rather that of less definitely directed conation and more definitely directed desire (312). All conation 'aims at' something (311, 314). Husserl is ready to admit sensations of desire or sensations of impulse (*Begehrungsempfindungen*, *Triebempfindungen*) as non-intentional elements of will (*Log. Unt.*, ii., 373 f.; *Ideen*, 172).

¹⁰⁷*Psychol.*, 53, 202.

¹⁰⁸*Ibid.*, 139, 191, 296, 346.

abstracted from the whole of an intentional experience, they are always (with the exception of peripherally directed conation) impalpable.¹⁰⁹ Messer does not attempt to draw up a list; we must therefore make it up for ourselves as best we can.

Under the head of consciousness of object, we have, first, the acts of ideation in the wider sense: acts of perception, of memory and of imagination.¹¹⁰ Then follow the acts of conception or thinking or knowing (*Wissen*).¹¹¹ Here we find, to begin with, the experience of concept or meaning.¹¹² Messer further names the acts of relating, of comparing, of judging, and of knowing in the pregnant sense (*Erkenntnis*).¹¹³ Judgment is a synthetic act of relating, comprising at least two members, which is accompanied by the strictly elementary act of affirmation or negation.¹¹⁴ Since every synthetic act may be translated into a simple act, the propositional act of judgment has a nominal act as its parallel.¹¹⁵ Since, moreover, judgments may be passed with all degrees of subjective assurance, we have attendant acts ranging from conviction to conjecture.¹¹⁶ Finally, over against judgment stand supposal, which bears the same relation to judgment as imagination to perception and memory, and the bare entertainment of a thought, shorn of all reference whether to validity or to invalidity.¹¹⁷

Later in the book we come upon the acts of intellectual evaluation and intellectual preference. The former, as judgments of value, may be subsumed to the general category of judgment. It is not clear that the acts of preference may be subsumed, in like manner, to the general category of comparison.¹¹⁸

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, 202 f. These acts are not characterized attributively, as they are by Husserl and by Messer himself in *Empf. u. Denken* (50 ff.). We get a hint of quality and material, however, in such passages as *Psychol.*, 138 f., 204, 208.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*, 139, 191 f. Messer does not seem to be quite as certain as Husserl (*Log. Unt.*, ii., 364; *Ideen*, 224 ff.) of the specific act-character of imagination. He says, indeed,—though in the context of explanatory psychology,—that the distinction of memory and imagination springs rather from practical and epistemological than from psychological needs (*Psychol.*, 346).—It is to be noted that the total acts (intentional experiences) of memory and imagination may be either palpable or impalpable: 221, 346.

Whether the *Bildbewusstsein* of *Psychol.*, 138 is elementary, we are not told. According to *Empf. u. Denken*, 60 f., it is not.

¹¹¹*Psychol.*, 139, 202.

¹¹²*Ibid.*, 207.

¹¹³*E. g.*, *ibid.*, 214, 212, 209, 216.

¹¹⁴*Ibid.*, 207, 211, 212 f.

¹¹⁵*Ibid.*, 208.

¹¹⁶*Ibid.*, 219.

¹¹⁷*Ibid.*, 220.

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*, 303 f., 305. In the latter passage, *Vergleichung* and *Vorziehen* are distinguished.

Under the head of consciousness of state, we have as palpable elements, first, the non-intentional simple feelings (or the great majority of them), and secondly the objectively directed feelings (affective evaluations, feelings of value) and the corresponding acts of affective preference.¹¹⁹ Lastly, the consciousness of cause includes conations, or at least those definitely directed conations which merit the name of appetite or desire, and acts of will. Messer insists that conations and acts of will belong to distinct classes of elementary experiences.¹²⁰

There remains the phenomenon of attention. Descriptively regarded, attention is not an act; it is rather that attitude (*Verhalten*) of the I in which our consciousness of objects (the phrase is used, at first, in the narrower sense) is formed or constituted: "objects exist for us only in so far as we are attentive to them."¹²¹ Attention thus stands in intimate relation to the consciousness of objects; indeed, we need not scruple to use this phrase in its wider sense, seeing that the objects of affective evaluation, of affective preference and of will are also objects of attention.¹²² While, however, the mere fact that an object is given us guarantees the presence of attention, the increase of the clearness and distinctness of the object with increasing concentration of attention is sufficiently regular to serve as a descriptive character.¹²³

§12. The systems which, in their phenomenological or descriptive aspects, we have now briefly reviewed may fairly be considered as typical of the whole psychology of act. Our purpose is critically to survey this psychology, and in particular to decide whether it has been more successful than functional psychology in its attempt to establish a special class of 'psychical' phenomena as the given subject-matter of psychological investigation. There are, however, among the authors to whom we have referred, two—Witasek and Messer—who, as exper-

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*, 276, 303, 305. For emotions, see note 99 above.

¹²⁰*Ibid.*, 311.

¹²¹*Ibid.*, 254.

¹²²*Ibid.*, 256.

¹²³*Ibid.*, 256, 267; cf. 50 f. Messer seems to have forgotten that the object is ordinarily transcendent, so that its clearness and distinctness cannot serve as a psychological character of attention (137 f.). It is true that his instance, of sensitivity and sensible discrimination, implies theoretically an immanent object; but he has told us (140 f.), in regard to this very matter, that in point of fact the observer usually adopts the 'natural,' 'objective' attitude. Surely, then, it is clearness and distinctness of the 'content' or 'sense' of the act (the material, in Husserl's wider sense) that must characterize the attentive experience. See, however, *Empf. u. Denken*, 120, note 3.

imentalists, make appeal to our own interest, and who, as writers of text-books, seem directly to challenge comparison. Witasek, as we have said, belongs to the school of Meinong, and Messer to the schools of Husserl and Külpe. Let us see, then, as a preliminary to our main task, in how far these psychologists agree in their teaching.

The question that naturally stands first, the question of the classification of psychical phenomena, we shall discuss later. Passing this by, we take up in their order the principal points of the two systems.

(1) Both Witasek and Messer recognize the distinction of act and content. But Witasek regards these moments as inseparable; there is no act without content, and no content without act; whereas Messer affirms that acts (the act-characters of intentional experiences) may stand alone, as fully constitutive of consciousness, and that sensory contents may appear in the background of consciousness unaccompanied by acts.¹²⁴

(2) Witasek accepts Brentano's law without reservation; there is no judgment, feeling or desire that is not based upon ideation. Messer, on the contrary, regards all consciousness as consciousness-of: a pleasant or unpleasant feeling may, by its intrinsic nature, be objectively directed; and an object "may just as originally be desired or willed as ideated and thought." Yet it cannot be said that Messer rejects the law: his statements are always qualified.¹²⁵

(3) Witasek defines sensations as "perceptive ideations of the simplest possible contents." There is, therefore, an act of sensation in addition to the sensory content. For Messer there is no act of sensation; the sensory

¹²⁴Witasek, *Grundlinien d. Psychol.* (cited henceforth in this § as *W*), 1908, 75; Messer, *Psychol.* (cited henceforth in this § as *M*), 203, 255. In *Empf. u. Denken*, 1908, Messer grants that sensations may appear, without acts, in the background of consciousness (40), but leaves the separate occurrence of contentless acts an open question (100 ff.). Husserl, in *Log. Unt.*, ii., seems to accept the actless content (372, 427), but denies that the act-character, the complex of quality and material, can stand absolutely alone (560 ff.; cf. 68 ff.). In *Ideen* (172) he leaves both questions unanswered. Lipps (*Leitfaden d. Psychol.*, 1909, 15) asserts that all contents or images are, implicitly or explicitly, representative, images of objects; whether there is a strictly "imageless thinking" he will not decide. Stumpf believes that sensations may be present and may undergo change without our 're-marking' the fact: but then these sensations are phenomena, not subject-matter of psychology. He inclines toward the acceptance of imageless thinking: but, again, every function must on his view have some sort of correlated content (*Erscheinungen*, 1907, 11, 25, 34).—The experimental data regarding imageless thought do not here concern us.

¹²⁵*W*, 97, 315; *M*, 66, 303, 314. In the first passage from *M*, feeling and will "somehow include or presuppose consciousness of objects [in which sense?];" it is as if Messer had not yet contemplated the chapter on value. In 303 there is an 'intimate connection' of knowing and feeling: but is the knowing basal? In 314 the reference of conation and willing to objects may be termed "practical ideation," ideation being taken "in the most general meaning of the word." Yet the objective reference has just been declared intrinsic!—In *Empf. u. Denken*, 53 ff., Messer accepts Brentano's law in Husserl's formulation.

content is "perfused and quickened by the thought-intention" of perception.¹²⁶

(4) Witasek, after some hesitation, admits the primary data of visual and tactual space-consciousness to the rank of sensations. His position in regard to time is not clear, though he leans toward the acceptance of a true sensation of time-present. Messer, on the other hand, has palpable content-elements of space and time (time-present, time-past, time-future), but no specific acts correlated with these contents.¹²⁷

(5) Messer's palpable impressions of 'same,' 'like,' 'different,' etc. are 'given with' sensory contents and 'founded upon' them. They are, psychologically, of the same order as sensations, and have no specific acts. Witasek agrees with respect to concomitance and dependence; but he transforms the 'impressions' into complete ideations of a special kind, namely, 'produced' ideations, or ideations which the subject, under the influence of sensations and by their assistance, produces (so to say) out of himself.¹²⁸

(6) Witasek places, alongside of sensations and produced ideations' the third class of reproduced ideations. He thus brackets together the ideas of memory and of imagination, which Messer keeps apart. It is not clear whether Messer has an act of bare reproduction. He recognizes acts of

¹²⁶W, 102, 218, 298 f.; M, 75 f., 139; *Empf. u. Denken*, 19 f., 45. So Husserl, *Log. Unt.*, ii., 245, 371, 714; *Ideen*, 172. For Stumpf, sensation as a mode of primitive perceiving, is all act (*Ersch.*, 16; cf. Brentano, *PES*, 103, 190, etc.). Lipps spoke in 1903 (*Leitfaden*, 2) of act and content of sensation; the act is the 'my having' of later editions, and the term does not further appear. Indeed, in 1905 Lipps rebukes those who talk of the 'act' of sensation; what they mean, he says, is act of thought! He criticises Husserl on the ground, apparently, that Husserl's athetical act of simple ideation is an act of sensation: but of course it is not. He further criticises those who make sensation a mode of consciousness of objects, and here he undoubtedly has Meinong in mind. See T. Lipps, "Inhalt und Gegenstand: Psychologie und Logik," *Sitzungsber. d. kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1905, 516 ff., 521; A. Meinong, "Ueber Gegenstände höherer Ordnung," etc., *Zeits. f. Psych.*, xxi., 1899, 187 ff., 198 f.; "Bemerkungen über den Farbenkörper und das Mischungsgesetz," *ibid.*, xxxiii., 1903, 3 ff.; "Ueber Gegenstandstheorie," *Untersuchungen zur Gegenstandstheorie und Psychologie*, 1904, 14; R. Ameseder, "Beiträge zur Grundlegung der Gegenstandstheorie," *ibid.*, 93 ff.—It may be added that Lipps' real process of sensation has its object: *Leitfaden*, 1909, 79 f.

¹²⁷W, 171 ff., 201 ff., 215 ff.; M, 148 f., 176; *Empf. u. Denken*, 24 ff. Stumpf (*Ersch.*, 4, 23) regards these things as phenomenal. For Lipps, the *Anschauungsformen* of time and space are the qualitatively new products of extensive fusion (of real processes or of conscious contents): *Leitfaden*, 1909, 98 f., 103 ff.

¹²⁸W, 225, 232; M, 180; *Empf. u. Denken*, 25 f. Stumpf (*Ersch.*, 4, 7, 16, 22 f., 33) has a class of relations distinct both from phenomena and from functions. Lipps ascribes the relations to apperception: they are "modes in which objects are referred to one another in the apperceiving I," though they are "unequivocally determined by the objects" themselves: *Leitfaden*, 1909, 161, 164.

imagination and of memory: the latter (as we shall see) belongs to another part of Witasek's system.¹²⁹

(7) Both Messer and Witasek recognize the specificity of judgment. We note, however, several points of difference. (a) For Messer, the act of judgment is always at least bimembral; the act is, in Meinong's phrase, synthetical. For Witasek, judgment may be either synthetical or merely thetical. (b) Witasek finds in the act of judgment two invariable moments, affirmation-negation and belief or conviction, and an occasional moment, evidence (of certainty, of probability). Messer identifies the invariable moments: affirmation-negation, acknowledgment-rejection, taking-as-true (as-untrue) and conviction are, for him, one and the same. Evidence he regards as a condition of affirmation-negation, and judgments experienced evidentially for the first time he marks off as acts of knowledge (*Erkenntnis*). (c) Witasek and Messer agree that a judgment may be passed with different degrees of subjective assurance. For Witasek, however, the difference resides in an intensive variation of the act-moment of conviction; for Messer, who does not recognize intensive gradation of act, it consists in the replacement of a taking-as-true by a taking-as-probable or a taking-as-possible. Judgments of possibility, in Witasek's system, are judgments of subsistence, as distinguished from judgments of existence. (d) Messer subsumes inference to judgment: it is judgment whose relational members are themselves judgment-contents. Witasek looks upon inference as common both to judgment and to supposal.¹³⁰

(8) Messer's perception, as intentional experience, is practically identical with Witasek's produced ideation. Perception proper (as distinct from perceptive ideation) is for Witasek a special case of judgment. Messer, as we have seen, makes all judgment at least bimembral.¹³¹

¹²⁹W, 246 ff.; M, 192 f. Here the ideas of imagination and recollection are the two principal species of *Vorstellungen*, and recollection is distinguished from the mere 'renewal' of a perception. Yet M, 221 hints at an act-difference between perception as such and ideation as such (cf. K. Koffka, *Zur Analyse d. Vorstellungen u. ihrer Gesetze*, 1912, 270 ff.). In general, M speaks only of imagination and recollection.—Stumpf (*Ersch.*, 16) includes *Empfinden* and *Vorstellen* under *Wahrnehmen*: it seems that only the phenomena differ. Lipps has a bare *Vorstellen* as receptive experience or *Widerfahrnis*; he has also acts of imagination; and he has acts of (introspective) recollection both at the level of perception and at that of judgment (*Leitfaden*, 1909, 16 ff., 20 f. 336). For Husserl's analysis see *Log. Unt.*, ii., 463 ff., 471 f.

¹³⁰W, 279 ff., 295 f., 310; M, 206 ff.; *Empf. u. Denken*, 138 ff. The doctrine of judgment (like that of form-quality, which I avoided in a previous note) is too detailed for discussion at this point. For Lipps' view, that judgment is my acknowledgment of an object's claim, see G. Anschütz, "Theodor Lipps' neuere Urteilslehre: eine Darstellung," *Arch. f. d. ges. Psychol.*, xxx., 1914, 240 ff., 329 ff. I further note only that Stumpf (*Ersch.*, 26; cf. Brentano, *PES*, 260 ff.) finds in judgment "a new functional attitude;" that Messer's distinction of one-rayed and many-rayed acts (M, 207) derives from Husserl (*Ideen*, 247 f.); and that Meinong discusses thetical and synthetical judgments in *Ueber Annahmen*, 1902, esp. 145.

¹³¹W, 239, 288 ff.; M, 162. Stumpf, following Brentano (*Tonpsychol.*, i., 1883, 96; cf. *PES*, 277), at first raised perception to the rank of judgment; he now (*Ersch.*, 16) makes perceiving prejudgmental. Lipps uses *Wahrnehmung* in two senses: for a *Widerfahrnis*, and for the consciousness of reality of the presented object. In either case perception is prejudgmental (*Leitfaden*, 1909, 15 f; Anschütz, *op. cit.*, 334).

(9) Recollection and recognition are also, for Witasek, forms of judgment. Messer does not distinguish between them; and his act of recollection or act of recognition is not a judgment, but a mode of ideation.¹³²

(10) Both Messer and Witasek, again, recognize the specificity of supposal. According to Witasek, however, supposal stands to judgment as reproduced ideation (ideas of memory and imagination) stands to perceptive (produced) ideation; according to Messer, it stands to judgment as imagination stands to perception and memory (recollection). Moreover, Witasek's supposal includes what Messer distinguishes as supposal and as the bare entertainment of thoughts. And Witasek's supposal further covers hypothesis, which is for Messer a "more or less probable judgment."¹³³

(11) Attention receives markedly different treatment in the two systems. Messer, we remember, places attention outside of his three phenomenological classes. It is neither knowing nor feeling nor willing; it is an attitude of the subject wherein and whereby objects are constituted. Witasek finds the nuclear fact of attention in a thetical act of judgment, an act of apprehension. Attention is thus on all fours with perception, recollection and recognition.¹³⁴

(12) In the psychology of feeling, we expect differences. It is noteworthy, nevertheless, that for Witasek feeling is all act, while for Messer it is (save in the case of feelings of value) all content. It is curious, too, that the distinction between sense-feeling and aesthetic feeling is drawn on

¹³²W, 290 ff., 292 ff.; M, 192 f., 239, 247. Lipps has a feeling of familiarity, over and above the acts ('perceptive' and judgmental) of recollection: *Leitfaden*, 1909, 336.

¹³³W, 309, 311; M, 220. Lipps agrees with Messer as regards hypothesis, but considers supposals in general to be subjectively conditioned judgments (*Leitfaden*, 1909, 241 ff.). Stumpf also hesitates to accept the specificity of supposals (*Ersch.*, 30). Husserl looks upon supposal as a by-mode of positional consciousness (*eine.. seitabstehende Modifikation der Glaubenssetzung*), and declares that Meinong's *Annahme* is an equivocal term (*Ideen*, 224, 228). For Meinong himself, supposal is a fundamental psychical fact, to be included along with judgment under the general heading of thought (*Ueber Annahmen*, 1902, 266, 276 ff.). If one is bent upon making it a form of judgment, then it will be a judgment of imagination (*Ueber die Erfahrungsgrundlagen unseres Wissens*, 1906, 60; cf. *Ueber Annahmen*, 285).

¹³⁴W, 297; M, 254. In *Empf. u. Denken* (120) attention is not constitutive of our consciousness of objects, but is simply "an especially high degree of the consciousness of objects." Husserl, in the *Log. Unt.*, ii., has in fact left things obscure. He is clear that attention covers the whole range "des anschauenden und denkenden Meinens" (162 ff.); and he is clear that "acts must be there" if we are to live ourselves into them, *i. e.*, to attend to their objects (385). But he does not decide whether this attending is itself an act (386). In the *Ideen* attention is, definitely, not an act (65). It is rather a ray, issuing from the pure I and terminating on the object; it is therefore immanent in all acts which are attitudes or acts of the I itself; it shows itself phenomenologically in noetic and correlated noematic modifications which have a peculiarly subjective character (192). Messer in *M* professes to follow Lipps: but he is taking Lipps very loosely (*Leitfaden*, 1909, 79, 142). Objects are constituted, for Lipps, by the terminal act of the conscious activity of apprehension. Stumpf, who (as we saw above: note 20) at first made attention a feeling, now ascribes to the function of remarking a specific attribute (*Merkmal*) of distinctness which he characterizes figuratively as a greater or less "accumulation of consciousness" (*Ersch.*, II, 17).

diametrically opposite lines. According to Witasek, the aesthetic feelings are directed wholly upon ideational content: change of act (as from sensation to reproduction) leaves them unaffected. Sense-feelings, on the other hand, are essentially bound up with ideational act: pain felt and pain remembered are radically different things. According to Messer, the sense-feelings are feelings which attach directly to sensory contents, and the aesthetic feelings are feelings based upon "acts of the consciousness of objects." The difference which we expected could hardly be more extreme.¹³⁵

(13) Messer devotes a chapter of his book to the consciousness of value. The primitive form of this consciousness is the affective, which at its simplest is an act of feeling, *i. e.*, an objectively directed pleasantness or unpleasantness. In Witasek's system its position is very different. Just as there are feelings based upon acts and other feelings based upon contents of sensation, so it is with judgment: the logical feelings or feelings of knowledge are based upon acts of judgment, the feelings of value or ethical feelings upon judgment contents. The difficulty which we feel in Messer's account—how a simple feeling, any more than a simple sensation, can of itself assume or acquire intentionality—is thus avoided. Moreover, Witasek is able to proceed from judgment to supposal. There is no feeling based on the act of supposal; but there are feelings—play-feelings, in contradistinction to real or serious feelings—based upon its contents. Of these Messer says nothing.¹³⁶

(14) In the psychology of volition, too, we expect differences; and again, we are not disappointed. The act of will which for Messer is elementary, and which is to be distinguished from the equally elementary conation or desire, is for Witasek the highest development of that same elementary desire. According to Messer, an object may be desired or willed as directly as it may be ideated or thought; according to Witasek no object, but only an objective, may be desired or willed; desire rests always upon some supposal. And so the differences continue. It may be remarked, as a curiosity of system-making, that in Witasek's chapter the simple reaction figures, in Külpe's sense, as the primary means "of an exact experimental investigation of volition, indeed, of conation at large," while Messer, a member of Külpe's school, disposes of it in his chapter on attention.¹³⁷

These fourteen points may suffice to show the likenesses and differences of the two systems. There is resemblance. We saw that there was a likeness between Wundt and Brentano as long ago as 1874,¹³⁸ and it would be strange if there were none between two experimental systems of forty years later. The resemblance, too, is more than general; it is a family likeness; the systems are of the same type. Yet the differences are many, so many that every chapter invites us to a choice between alternatives.

To trace the sources of such difference is not an easy matter. It is plain on the surface that Messer's system is syncretistic

¹³⁵W, 324 f.; M, 295 f.

¹³⁶W, 328, 330 f.; M, 303. For Lipps and Stumpf, feelings of value always imply judgments (*Leitfaden*, 1909, 341 f.; *Ersch.*, 27, 30). Husserl sets the problem in his own terms in *Ideen*, 239 ff.

¹³⁷W, 349, 351; M, 311, 314: for reaction, W, 363, M, 265, 273. Lipps derives will from conation (*Leitfaden* 1909, 258, 301 ff.). Stumpf (*Ersch.*, 26 f., 30) seems to include will under the emotive functions.

¹³⁸Cf. this JOURNAL, xxxii., 1921, 110 f.

and that Witasek's is logically compact; several influences have been at work on the one, and a single predominant influence has moulded the other. If, however, we consider the systems as wholes, we may perhaps formulate a chief ground of difference as follows. Messer is bent upon bridging the gulf between the palpable and the impalpable factors of consciousness, or (in Humean terms) upon linking up 'ideas' to 'impressions.' Hence, in spite of his aversion from 'sensationalism,' he devotes a great deal of space to the palpable, and even coquets with the notion of a 'functional indefiniteness' of palpable contents.¹³⁹ Witasek, on the contrary, carries the distinction of act and content back to the very lowest terms of conscious experience. But Witasek, in his turn, has all Brentano's affection for the judgment,—to which he adds Meinong's affection for the supposal: and so we find these things looming large throughout the second part of his system, where Messer deals upon a more independent basis with feeling and will.¹⁴⁰ Here is a real cause of systematic divergence. There are others, still upon our phenomenological level; and there are others, again, at the levels which we have not touched. While then a detached view brings out the family resemblance of which we have spoken, the nearer and more limited view of a disciple can hardly fail to lead to partisanship. To the student of Messer, Witasek will appear heretical; and the student of Witasek must sharply question the orthodoxy of Messer.

§13. From this digression we turn to our main task: the appreciation of the psychology of act taken as a whole. It would of course be easy, if our aim were simply polemical, to dismiss the matter with the simple statement that, 'as a whole,' there is no psychology of act. And it is true that, in the concrete, we have had to do with psychologies rather than psychology, with differentiation rather than consolidation. From the common

¹³⁹ *M*, 180: the idea recurs in *Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.*, xxxii., 1914, 54. The notion of functional indefiniteness (*M*, 195) is, on Messer's own showing, altogether out of place in the context of content: cf. the distinction of descriptive and functional concepts in "Ueber den Begriff des 'Aktes'," *Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.*, xxiv., 1912, 250, etc. For the notion itself, see G. E. Müller, *Zur Analyse d. Gedächtnistätigkeit u. d. Vorstellungsverlaufes*, iii., 1913, 545 ff.

¹⁴⁰ Witasek's enthusiasm leads him to remark that "the transcending which is peculiar to our mind, the direction upon objects, is in strictness a function only of judgment or supposal" (*W*, 310). At least an incautious statement! For if direction-upon is the ear-mark of the psychical, and if the direction of an ideation is due to the 'cooperation' of a judgment or a supposal, it follows that the ideation as such is not psychical: in which case Brentano's law implies the commingling of psychical and non-psychical at the very centre of the psychical realm.

starting-point of intentionalism our authors have taken widely divergent paths. The question remains, however, how deep the sources of divergence lie,—whether they are only superficial and accidental, or whether they are fundamental. Until this question is faced and answered, we cannot either affirm or deny that psychology may be wrought out in terms of a peculiar class of intentional facts.

We shall put the act-systems, first, to a triple test, by considering their attitude in regard to classification, and to the special topics of sensation and attention.

(1) We begin with the classification of psychical phenomena. Here, again, it would be easy to show that the systems differ. Indeed, they differ so radically that one, two, three or four ultimates may be recognized.¹⁴¹ We must remember, however, that classification is, primarily, a matter of convenience, and that the functional and experimental schools have also been unable to supply a classification that should be generally accepted. All that the differences prove, therefore, is that intentionalism is no unerring or unequivocal guide to arrangement. That is worth noting: but we shall get more light if we consider the classifications adopted by an individual psychologist at different stages of his systematic thinking. We have, fortunately, two examples of the kind required, in the works of Stout and Lipps.

The classification put forward in the first edition of Stout's *Manual* (1899) is very simple. It may be represented as follows:

- I. Ultimate modes of being conscious of an object
 - a. The cognitive attitude or cognition or knowing
 - b. The feeling attitude or feeling [always dependent upon cognition]
 - c. The conative attitude or striving [coordinate with cognition]
- II. Experience not at the moment contributing to the cognitive function of consciousness
 - d. Sentience or sub-consciousness

There can be no doubt that Stout is here trying to cover the whole field of consciousness by way of objective reference. Sentience, the outlying category, is after all nothing more than cognition at rest: modifications of consciousness that may and

¹⁴¹The single ultimate, of which we have so far had no example, is characteristic of the conational system of S. Alexander: "there is but one ultimate mental process [a continuous tissue of acts, or awarenesses, or enjoyments], namely conation" ("Foundations and Sketch-plan of a Conational Psychology," *Brit. Journ. Psych.*, iv., 1911, 243; cf. H. A. Reyburn, "Mental Process," *Mind*, N. S. xxviii., 1919, 19 ff.). Something of the same sort appears in the psychology of P. Natorp. Consciousness has three moments, which may be distinguished by abstraction: the I, the content, and the relation between them. Since the I is presupposed by psychology, and since the relation to the I is an irreducible and indescribable ultimate which, like the I, is a precondition of psychology, it follows that psychology has to do only with content (*Allgemeine Psychologie*, i., 1912, 24, 33.).

will present objects happen, at some given time, not to be discharging this presentational function, and must accordingly be distinguished from their active kindred. They are, nevertheless, as the term sub-consciousness attests, only at a lower level of the development which culminates in presentation.¹⁴²

The classification of the third edition (1913) is less simple. It may perhaps be represented as follows:¹⁴³

Modes of consciousness

- I. Immediate experiences which are primarily objective (are themselves primarily objects), or presentations
 - a. Sensations
 - b. Images
 - c. Imageless or amorphous presentations
- II. Immediate experiences which are primarily subjective, or ultimate modes of the relation of the conscious subject to its objects
 - a. Simple apprehension [precondition of *b* and *c*]
 1. Implicit apprehension or sub-consciousness
 2. Marginal awareness
 3. Explicit apprehension
 - b. The cognitive attitude
 - c. The attitude of interest
 1. Passive: the feeling attitude
 2. Active: the conative attitude

Both tables have two main divisions; but we note at once that the divisions do not tally; in the second table Stout has given up the attempt to classify by way of objective reference alone. The presentations of 1899 were, in the language of 1913, 'subjective' experiences, modes of cognition; and if sentience is not presentation, it is at any rate something that was presentation a moment ago and will be presentation a moment hence. Now, however, this sentience has been marked off from its alternative sub-consciousness, and has expanded into a new category of objective presentation, altogether distinct from cognition; while sub-consciousness, remaining 'subjective,' finds its place within a new—and fundamental—differentiation of objective reference. The whole perspective of the system has changed.¹⁴⁴

Lipps' original classification (1903) is also very simple. There are four ultimate classes of the "conscious contents or conscious experiences" which form the subject-matter of psychology:

¹⁴²G. F. Stout, *A Manual of Psychology*, 1899, 56 ff., 68 ff. That all was not well with the concept of 'sentience' I pointed out in *Thought-processes*, 1909, 224 ff.

¹⁴³I say 'perhaps' only because I am taking the three forms of simple apprehension from the chapter on Attention, and attention is conation (*ibid.*, 1913, 125).

¹⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 1913, 3 f., 5 ff., 11, 102 ff., 129, 140, 176, 532.

- I. "The directly experienced I with its determinations, the feelings" (absolutely subjective contents);
- II. "The contents of sensation and sense-perception, *i. e.*, the simple sensory contents, the complexes of sensory contents, and the spatial and temporal forms and modes of their arrangement" (absolutely objective contents);
- III. "The directly experienced relations of the I to what is objective, and the relations of the I in general" (intermediate contents); and
- IV. "The ideational contents corresponding with all these conscious contents" (secondarily objective contents).

This table is exhaustive; it names all the genera of contents of consciousness; "there are no other conscious experiences."¹⁴⁵ And when the reader has assured himself that the "phenomenal acts" belong to the class of relations, or contents intermediate between the I and its objects, the complete outline of Lipps' system lies before him.

In 1909, however, Lipps has given up the idea of an inventory of consciousness. Psychology now has to do with "consciousness and conscious experiences;" and as this subject-matter unfolds, in the introductory sections of the book,¹⁴⁶ we find an intercrossing complexity that cannot by any trick of strait-jacketing be reduced to a single table. The following summary shows some of the complications with which the beginning student must contend.

I. Lipps speaks of experiences, contents, acts, activities, states and colorings of consciousness.

Contents are not experiences; they are rather the images or impressions experienced in consciousness.

Acts, too, are not intrinsically experiences. In our acts of thought and conation we do not ordinarily experience the objects apprehended and desired. We experience objects "only in so far as we have adequate images of them."

Activities and states (which latter are identical with colorings) are experiences.

II. Experiences are either objective or subjective. The type of objective experience is sensation, the having of a simple sensory content. The term covers also experiences of bare sense-perception, the mere having of a complex of sensory contents in spatial and temporal arrangement; and the bare ideation in which we have, as imaginal content, the image of some object in the outside world. All other experiences are subjective. Their type is the feeling.

The acts of thought, again, although (as we have seen) they are not intrinsically experiences, are either subjective or objective, according to the nature of their object.

III. It is to be noted that 'experience' by no means implies completeness or independence of the conscious datum so named. In sensation, for example, I have as objective experience the having of a sensory content, and as subjective experience the experience of myself as sensing. Every objective

¹⁴⁵Lipps, *Leitfaden*, 1903, 16 ff., esp. 20.

¹⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 1909, 1-43.

experience thus includes or incorporates a subjective experience. In the same way my acts, though not in themselves experiences, are subjective experiences in the sense that in and with them I experience myself as thinking, desiring, etc.

IV. Lipps distinguishes receptive experiences, acts and states. The receptive experiences are those that we 'run up against:' sensations, the experience of claim. At the opposite pole from them stand the acts of conation, in which we aim at some object. The affective states differ from both.

V. Sensations are differentiated as sight, hearing, etc.

States are all included within the opposition pleasantness-unpleasantness, or move in that dimension. Since, however, many states are named, it appears that a further differentiation must be made.

Acts are specified in some detail. Thus we have acts of production (evocation of images of imagination), acts of mixed reception and production (thought), acts of aiming (conation), acts of 'bracing up to' and 'putting the final touch on' (starting and stopping points of conative activity), acts of acknowledgment (judgment). The relations are not quite clear. Perhaps there are two genera of acts: the one including as species the acts of imagination, thought and judgment, the other those of conation and conative activity.

VI. Conation and activity may be either active or passive.

Conation and activity may, further, be either inner or outer, according to the nature of the object on which they are directed. Inner activity is activity of apprehension, activity of imagination, activity of apperception (which latter is, again, variously specified). Outer activity is bodily activity.

It appears that we have in the experiences of conation (subjectified experience of claim) and of conative activity (feelings of actual and potential activity) a foundation or undercurrent of subjective experience distinguishable from the specific feelings which colour it: but the point is not clear.

VII. Along with acts and activities are given subjective experiences of their relation: experiences of conditioning, of issuance, of dependence, which Lipps groups together as experiences of motivation.

VIII. Every conscious experience and everything experienced in consciousness may later recur in the form of a reproductive image or image of ideation.

IX. Consciousness is intentional, but it is intentional in varying manner and degree. Sensations contain an object only potentially or implicitly. Acts of thought explicate these objects, in such wise that consciousness may thereafter busy itself with them; there is in thought "a peculiar interaction between the I and the objects." Conation and conative activity are, on the other hand, always 'aimed at' something; they 'are' the interrelation or the cooperation between the object with its claim and the individual consciousness. And since all feelings are colourings of this conative activity, I cannot feel without feeling myself somehow related to an object; I am cheerful or depressed, confident or in despair, 'about' something. Finally the experiences of motivation appear to be intentional in the same way as experiences of conation in general.

There is little here to suggest the tabular statement of 1903. No doubt, all the four classes of the earlier edition may be traced in the later; but our efforts at precise arrangement are baffled, and we wonder whether, after all, the simplicity of Lipps' first exposition was not itself rather apparent than real. At any rate, no clue to the psychological labyrinth is now to be found among

the conscious experiences. If we wish to set things in order we must go below and behind consciousness to the unconscious real.—

Summaries are tedious to make and tedious to read. We have undertaken them, in these two instances, for the light that they and the comparisons resulting from them may throw upon the act-systems in general. And we note, first, that they raise, pretty definitely, the doubt whether intentionalism is adequate to the whole subject-matter of psychology. That, to be sure, is a large question, which we could not, in any event, seek to answer at this point: we note only that it is raised, and raised at the very outset, by the act-systems themselves. Stout appears to have transgressed the boundaries which he originally accepted, and Lipps saves the principle only by adding an implicit to his explicit intentionality. In another way, however, the summaries afford us positive light,—light upon the attitude and interest of the authors of these systems. It is clear that the interest lies in argument and discussion and explication and distinction, in the logic of system, rather than in the facts of observation.

It is, indeed, nothing less than illuminating to read Stout's editions with an eye to facts. The third edition has sought to bring its references down to date, so that Sherrington replaces Foster and Myers replaces Ebbinghaus. But the writer's factual equipment has increased hardly at all. 'Views' are what Stout is concerned with, the critical discussion of other men's views and the exposition of his own. The whole vast field of experiment, with its perplexing entanglements of dependence on conditions and theoretical bias and degree of training of observers and all the rest,—this whole bulk of raw material for the science of psychology is passed indifferently by, for what Locke and Hume and Lotze, and Ward and James and Ladd and Marshall and Stout himself 'think' about psychology. Even where, as in the instance of experiments upon the lower animals, Stout refers to monographic sources, even here his attitude is not primarily that of the man of science, careful of method and wary of generalization; he is interested rather in the inferences that have been drawn from observation, in the systematic setting of the facts, in their interpretation and explanation. And as to Lipps! the student of Lipps will hardly realize that there may be, within the compass of psychology, facts of the same existential order that he has met in his study of physics and biology. He reads of unutterables, indescribables, indefinables, uniques, which he is required to 'experience;' and he reads through a serried array of imperatively dogmatic statements regarding these ultimates, which he is required to accept.

Should he wish to go further, he is referred to other works by Lipps himself.¹⁴⁷

We may grant that Lipps' opinions, and Stout's too, are heartily worth knowing; we may grant also—nay more, we shall insist—that logical construction has its necessary place, is (so to say) the full half of a scientific system. Only we cannot forget that the half here is less than the whole. Moreover, we see from our summaries that the statements originally made, whether dogmatic or argumentative, are sadly instable. Ward once remarked that systematic psychology "is not liable to change every half-dozen years."¹⁴⁸ What is it then, in this psychology of act, that does change? Something changes: simple apprehension is superadded upon cognition, the pure I is ruled out and invited in, perception drops from the judgmental to the prejudgmental level, contents are and are not experiences, sensation has and has not an act of its own, and so forth. Here, surely, are systematic changes! Nor would they be open to criticism if they reflected and kept pace with the growing store of facts, and if the facts were set out at large as ground and warrant of the changes. In the absence of grounding facts, and in view of the general trend and tenor of their work, we must conclude that the psychologising of Stout and Lipps is, essentially, a matter of applied logic. They begin with certain empirical concepts,—the objective reference of consciousness, the conscious I; they proceed to explicate these concepts as thoroughly and minutely as they can; and the longer and more earnestly they meditate, the greater is the wealth of discoverable meaning, the greater the number of its discriminable aspects. This, then, is the positive light that our summaries throw upon the act-systems.¹⁴⁹

(2) The mention of act and content of sensation brings us to a second point. There can be no possible question that sensation—however it is to be defined; and we need not, for a long time to come, enquire too curiously about its definition—has been, from the beginning, a source of real difficulty to the act-systems. The story is roughly told in the following table:

¹⁴⁷The third edition of the *Leitfaden* refers the reader to three books written by other authors: for sensation and fusion to Wundt's *Physiol. Psych.*, for tonal fusion to Stumpf's *Tonpsych.*, and for memory to M. Offner's *Das Gedächtnis*, a work which appeared while the new edition of the *Leitfaden* was in preparation.

¹⁴⁸*Mind*, N. S. iii., 1894, 143.

¹⁴⁹It may be added, in the sense of our previous discussions, that the scientific psychologist, whose addiction to fact may leave him neglectful of his logic, has a good deal to learn from this explication of concepts. I have sometimes been staggered to read what my own 'sensationalism' logically 'implied,' when I neither admitted the sensationalism nor acknowledged the implications. All the same, such logical criticism is salutary.

Sensation	Act	Content
Brentano, Höfler, Alexander	Psychical	Physical
Witasek, Geyser	Psychical	Psychical
Stumpf	Psychical	Phenomenological
Lipps, Husserl, Messer	None	Psychical

The table, as a mere outline, obscures many differences. Brentano identifies content with object; Höfler has an analogue to sensation proper in the ideation of a simple psychical, a psychological element; Alexander regards all psychical acts as acts of conation; and so on. The table takes account, too, only of certain systems in which the term 'act' is systematically employed. It omits Münsterberg's 'noetic relation,' and Stout's 'presentative function,' and so on. It shows, nevertheless, how real the difficulty is. The one thing certain is that, somewhere in the world, we come upon sensory contents; and then we must decide for ourselves whether they are physical or psychical or neither physical nor psychical. And we have not even so much of assurance as regards the sensory act.¹⁵⁰

The doubt raised by our summaries, whether intentionalism is adequate to the subject-matter of psychology, seems therefore to be well founded. For if one starts out with intentionalism one can hardly find anything simpler than the perception of external objects. But then one is reminded, whether historically or empirically, that there is something logically prior¹⁵¹ to perception, namely, sensation; and yet sensation is not obviously intentional. What, then, is to be done? Well, one may speak of intentional consciousness as 'consciousness in the pregnant sense,'—whatever that may mean; one may draw a distinction between matter and form of consciousness,—as if form were in some way a guarantee of intention; one may oppose 'potential' to 'actual' intention,—whatever, again, that may mean. Or one may throw the sensory content overboard, and keep the sensory act as a mode of perception or ideation or conation. Or one may hold fast to the letter of intentionalism, and make the sensation, act and content together, an humbler understudy of perception. It is a matter of taste which course one adopts, and it is a matter of skill how well the resulting system holds together. Whence of course it follows that no degree of subjective assurance and no refinement of critical acumen

¹⁵⁰A. Höfler, *Psychologie*, 1907, 210; S. Alexander, "On Sensations and Images," *Proc. of the Aristot. Soc.*, 1910, N. S. x., 1910, 1 ff.; J. Geyser, *Lehrbuch d. allg. Psych.*, 1912, 49, 224, 306; H. Münsterberg, *Grundzüge d. Psych.*, i., 1900, 309; Stout, *Manual*, 1913, 210.

¹⁵¹Or, perhaps, chronologically prior; sensation, in certain systems, still has a genetic flavour. Cf. H. Hofmann, "Untersuchungen über den Empfindungsbegriff," *Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.*, xxvi., 1913, 1 ff.

on one's own part can prevent a like assurance and a countering criticism on the part of others. But a house divided against itself shall not stand.

(3) After all, though, it may be said, we have not proved that the 'house' is divided. Sensations lie on the outskirts of psychology, form the ragged edge of the psychological system; we meet them at the outset, but we have very little to do with them thereafter. Besides, the difficulty, such as it is, may readily be cut; it has been cut cleanly enough by Stumpf, who dismisses all the doubtful elements, all sensory and imaginal contents, to a limbo of their own. Why should we lay so much emphasis upon a merely preliminary difficulty?

The objection forgets that we are talking of system, and that a system must be systematic throughout. It forgets that the diversity of opinion among the psychologists of act is due precisely to their effort toward a consistent systematization. Their chief interest is here, on the side of applied logic; and a break-down at the beginning is, logically, as serious as a break-down later on. We need not rest, however, with this reply. We will go to the heart of the systems, to the doctrine of attention; and we shall find that attention, no less than sensation, is a stumbling-block to the intentionalist school.

We hasten to make an exception of Lipps; but then Lipps' whole system is exceptional. It embodies, so to say, two psychologies, real and phenomenal, unconscious and conscious. Every real psychical process has, according to Lipps, an intrinsic energy, in virtue of which it attracts or appropriates psychical force. Attention, now, is a term which belongs in strictness, not to consciousness, but to the domain of the real mind: it is nothing else than the psychical force which, accruing to a real process, lifts it (under favorable conditions) above the limen of consciousness. We then 'have' a conscious content. If the process appropriates still more force, or if attention turns to it in greater degree, it becomes a process of thought, and we have in consciousness the activity of apprehension which culminates in the simple act of thought. Here is the intellectual limen. If the process is capable of yet further appropriation, it becomes an apperceptive process, and we experience in consciousness the activity of apperception, which results, according to circumstances, in various acts of higher intellectual orders. Attention, throughout, is the psychical force which 'turns to' or 'is appropriated by' the real process of ideation, of thought, of apperception.

No one will deny that this doctrine of attention is logically constructed. Our objection, if we object at all, can only be that it rests upon a basis of pure invention. That is for Lipps neither an objection nor a difficulty; he insists that invention is neces-

sary, and that his own "substructure of thought" is adequate to the psychological occasion. If, as he admits, we know nothing of process and stage of process, of psychical energy and psychical force, that truly is our misfortune; but we may then be all the more grateful to thought for supplying the deficiencies of knowledge.¹⁵²

Such is the exceptional system, for which attention has no terrors. The rest are less happy. Stumpf, as we know, identifies his primitive function of perceiving with a 'taking note of,' attention thus seems to be present to consciousness from the first. This perceiving has a graded attribute of distinctness (*Deutlichkeit*), which Stumpf nevertheless trusts so little that he is forced to speak figuratively of an 'accumulation of consciousness.' Messer, getting no help from Husserl, turns to Lipps; attention is an attitude of the I, logically prior to our consciousness of objects,—and all consciousness is consciousness of objects. Witasek, in flat contradiction to the school of Husserl, makes attention an act, one of the ubiquitous acts of judgment. "To many contemporary psychologists," he adds, "this opinion will appear nothing less than monstrous; all the same it is true; and anyone who has a discerning eye for the psychological specificity of the act of judgment will recognize it without difficulty in the constitution of attention." Geyser, who paraphrases attention in Lippsian terms as our "intellectual occupation" with an object, must transcend consciousness in both directions in order to bring his subject under control. Attention as psycho-physiological energy is responsible for the clearness of certain conscious contents; and attention as the intellectual occupation of the mind with the contents of consciousness (this 'mind' is a matter of supplementary inference, not of observation) is responsible for our reflective fixation of them. So there are two attentions, and neither is psychological. Pfänder, like the Messer of *Empfindung und Denken*, makes attention the higher degree of our consciousness of objects, the denser or more concentrated portion of the cone of light which issues from the I of consciousness and plays upon its immediate objects. Finally, Stout retains in all three editions the statements that "attention is simply identical with conation considered in its cognitive aspect" and that "conation and cognition are different aspects of one and the same process," statements which, in default of some equivocation, would seem to be irreconcilable.¹⁵³

¹⁵² *Leitfaden*, 1909, 78-83, 141-148.

¹⁵³ Witasek, *Grundlinien*, 297; Geyser, *Lehrbuch*, 256 ff., 261 ff., 724 f. See esp. 263: "This reflective fixation does not represent the consciousness of, *i. e.*, is not a mode of awareness, but is a holding fast of the content of which we are conscious, to the end that the mind energise on this content its acts of relating, and thereby extend contentwise its awareness of the content."—Stout, *Manual*, 1899, 247, 581; 1907, 257, 599; 1913, 367, 704; A. Pfänder, *Einführung in d. Psychol.*, 1904, 272 ff., 354 ff.

It was plainly a bad day for empiricism when the experimental movement brought attention to the forefront of systematic psychology.¹⁵⁴ Intentionalism can deal with perception and imagination and memory and thought and emotion and desire, but hardly with attention. As in sensation it finds too little, so in attention it finds too much. For what is attention, empirically taken, if it is not already and of its own nature intentional? It too is a surplusage, and so it suffers a fate akin to the fate of sensation. Either it is thrown out of consciousness, not (to be sure) into physics or phenomenology, but into a realm of logical priority; or else it is identified with some particular intentional process. And the extremes meet. Perception, which at its simplest is for Höfler and Witasek sensation, becomes for Stumpf, still in its simplest form, an implicit attention.

§14. It would seem then, that the differences among the act-systems are in fact fundamental and inevitable, not superficial and accidental. On the side of subject-matter, intentionalism cannot cope with sensation and attention, while it cannot either dispense with them. Witasek, it is true, takes heroic measures; sensation is perception, and attention is judgment: the system is saved. But who, outside of Meinong's school, will accept a salvation offered on such Procrustean terms? Besides, the interest in systemization, in applied logic for the sake of the logic, characterizes all the psychologists of act. Psychology appeals, so to say, to their personal ingenuity in relating and distinguishing and constructing; and where the appeal is thus individual, there—as in philosophy or poetry—the outcome will of necessity reflect the personality of the writer. We saw that there are many differences between Witasek and Messer. We may now safely say that these differences go deep. They are the differences, not of two scientific psychologists, but of two personalities expressing themselves in the terms of systematic psychology. If intentionalism is scientific, then science can no longer be called impersonal.

How indeed shall we account, otherwise than by personality, by training induced upon given temperament, for the varying definitions of the 'act' itself? An act for Lipps is a doing, the deed of the I of consciousness. The picture that rises from his pages is that of a strenuous and resourceful, highly self-conscious 'individual,' acting and reacting in a world of other individuals and of material things. An act for Husserl is something very different, something that by contrast almost suggests passivity: an experience of a certain essential constitution, of intrinsically

¹⁵⁴Cf. my *Feeling and Attention*, 1908, 171 ff.

intentional make-up. Husserl accordingly reminds us of nothing so much as the skilled lexicographer, teasing from the word before him every discriminable shade of meaning, and nicely distinguishing it from the words that everyday use has made us think synonymous. Stumpf's act, lastly, lies between these other two. It is active, in the sense that it is found or given as active; it is by no means the deed of an I. It is an active verb, moving amidst phenomena and relations, and generating its 'correlate,'—a sort of caddis-worm that houses itself variously in the sticks and shells and stones of its independently variable surroundings. We need not go further. We have an act which is my doing and is experienced as my doing; we have an act found as active ultimate among inactive ultimates; we have an act which is an embodied intention, the subject-matter of a morphology of knowledge. What, then, for psychology, is 'the act?' We are brought back, after all, to our polemical starting-point: there is no psychology of act, there are only psychologies. But we may now add, as at the beginning we could not, that on the basis of intentionalism there will be only psychologies.

Here, however, we remark a notable difference between the psychology of act and the psychology of function. There is no reason to suppose that functional psychology enjoys any long lease of life. It was born of the enthusiasm of the post-Darwinian days, when evolution seemed to answer all the riddles of the universe; it has been nourished on analogies drawn from a loose and popular biology; it will pass as other fashions pass. Even now, indeed, it may be passing. The movement that has labelled itself 'behaviorism'—a 'psychology' not only without a psyche and a psychical, but also without a psychological—appears to get its motivation, at any rate on the negative side, from dissatisfaction with the psychology of function.¹⁵⁵ But be that as it may, there is no seed of life in functionalism compared with the power of perennial self-renewal that inheres in intentionalism. Functional psychology (if we may again change the figure) is a parasite, and the parasite of an organism doomed to extinction, whereas intentionalism is as durable as common sense. We noted long ago that the empirical psychologist (we may now

¹⁵⁵Behaviorism has not yet become clear either as to its own working concepts or as to its relations to psychology: see A. Robinson, "Behavior as a Psychological Concept," *Proc. Arist. Soc.*, N. S., xviii., 1918, 271 ff. A reaction against functionalism is suggested by the biological flavor of behavioristic writings, and is expressly admitted by J. B. Watson (*Behavior, an Introduction to Comparative Psychology*, 1914, 8 f.). Logically, indeed, a strict behaviorism can have no quarrel with an existential psychology, since there is no point of contact between the two disciplines. The only possible relation is that of correlation, and the extreme behaviorist declines to correlate. Cf. my critique of Watson, "On 'Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It,'" *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, liii., 1914, no. 213.

say, the psychologist of intention) means to take mind as he finds it, and that like all the rest of the world, who are not psychologists, he finds it in use; he finds it actively at work in man's intercourse with nature and with his fellow-man, and in his discourse with himself.¹⁵⁶ That is how 'mind' naturally presents itself to common sense, to the man of affairs, to the intelligent man of science who lacks psychological training. A great mathematician and physicist, speaking in 1869 of the "phenomena of mind," declared that "science can be expected to do but little to help us here, since the instrument of research is itself the object of investigation," since (that is to say) the mind which we study is the mind by which we study, or the intentional experiences which we seek to know are the intentional experiences whereby we know. And if it is objected that fifty years have allowed a good deal of water to flow under our scientific bridges, we may point out that Stokes' words are repeated by the physicist Tait in 1885 and by the biologist Thomson in 1911.¹⁵⁷ They would be accepted today, without objection or reflection, by the vast majority of scientific men outside of psychology itself. Small wonder, then, that within psychology too this same common-sense attitude, an attitude natural to us as our mother-tongue, should never fail of representatives! We shall always have psychologists of Brentano's stripe: what we have tried to make clear is that these men will give us psychologies, but not (as Brentano hoped) psychology.

These conclusions may content us. In showing that intentionalism takes the obvious, natural, proximate, common-sense view of psychology and psychological problems, and that the adoption of this pre-scientific view as scientific puts a premium upon individual differences, upon personal ingenuity of explication and arrangement, we have probably done as much as by mere counter-argument we are able to do. It would be useless to write out, over against the psychologists of act, the list of those who deny that they find intentional experiences in the contents of consciousness, for the affirmative is always in better logical case than the negative. Moreover, the denial itself shifts the universe of discourse, or changes the point of view from which 'consciousness' is regarded. When Ach tells us that an observer reports, from the fore-period of a simple sensory reaction, one knowing (*Wissen*) and three to five awarenesses (*Bewusstheiten*), we may perhaps be surprised by the fullness of the report, and may even go so far as to suspect the influence of suggestive

¹⁵⁶This JOURNAL, xxxii., 1921, 119.

¹⁵⁷G. G. Stokes, Presidential Address, in *Report of the 39th Meeting of the Brit. Assn. for the Advancement of Science*, 1870, cv.; P. G. Tait, *Lectures on some Recent Advances in Physical Science*, 1885, 26; J. A. Thomson, *Introduction to Science*, 1911, 105.

questioning; but we do not meet the situation by declaring that "a knowing (*Wissen*) is never given in consciousness;" we have then simply substituted our own definition of psychology for that of Ach.¹⁵⁸ The one complete and positive reply to intentionalism is the existential system, the system that is partially and confusedly set forth (anything like completeness and purity of exposition is not possible to our present knowledge) in the works of Wundt and Külpe and Ebbinghaus.¹⁵⁹ If we can build psychology upon a definition that is scientific as the word 'science' is to be understood in the light of the whole history of human thought; and if we can follow methods and achieve results that are not unique and apart but, on the contrary, of the same order as the methods and results of physics and biology; then, by sheer shock of difference, the act-systems will appear as exercises in applied logic, stamped with the personality of their authors. They will not, on that account, languish and die, because 'mind in use' will always have its fascination, but they will no longer venture to offer themselves as science.¹⁶⁰

§15. Negative criticism always needs more words than positive construction. The upshot of the preceding paragraphs may, however, be condensed into a brief statement. The claim has been made that 'conscious' phenomena constitute a special

¹⁵⁸N. Ach, *Ueber die Willenstätigkeit und das Denken*, 1905, 40 f.; K. Marbe, *Experimentell-psychologische Untersuchungen über das Urteil, eine Einleitung in die Logik*, 1901, 92; cf. G. E. Müller, *Zur Analyse der Gedächtnistätigkeit und des Vorstellungsverlaufes*, iii., 1913, 542; A. Messer, *Experimentell-psychologische Untersuchungen über das Denken*, *Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.*, viii., 1906, 207 n. It is needless to say, after the criticism made of Ladd's psychology, that I agree with Marbe; I am here concerned with formal argument.

¹⁵⁹I am thinking, of course, of the earlier Külpe ("Das Ich und die Außenwelt," i., *Philos. Studien*, vii., 1892, 405; *Grundriss der Psychol.*, 1893, 27), and of Ebbinghaus before his work was edited by Dürr.

¹⁶⁰In *Thought-processes*, 60 f., I sought to 'psychologise' Brentano's act as being, existentially, the temporal factor intrinsic to psychological subject-matter. Thereupon a friendly critic remarked: "On peut s'étonner que Titchener... ait cru devoir exposer et discuter des théories dont la valeur psychologique est douteuse. Il s'agit plutôt d'analyses verbales, d'idéologie, de subtilités, de distinctions scolastiques" (T. Ribot, *Rev. phil.*, lxi., 1910, 650). My attempt sprang, indeed, from a rather desperate desire somehow to bring intentionalism and existentialism together at close quarters, and to transcend the mere calling of names. If the two schools were in any real sense schools of psychology, then—I thought—they must after all be concerned at bottom with the same problems; and I knew that the epithets 'scholastic' and 'sensationalist' were often applied ignorantly and unintelligently. The same year, 1910, gave us, however, Wundt's essay on "Psychologismus und Logizismus" (*Kleine Schriften*, i., 511 ff.), which amply justifies Ribot's reproaches.

class of objects of experience, immediately and radically distinct from phenomena that are not-conscious, and that the science of psychology has to do with the objects of this given class. The resulting systems are either functional or intentional. We have found that in both cases they are empirical, that is, technological; they begin and end with 'mind in use.' They represent what we may call an art of mental living as distinguished from a science of mental life,—a general 'applied psychology' that is logically prior to the special 'applied psychologies' of education, vocation, law, medicine, industry. Functional psychology is through and through teleological, and by biological analogy lays down general norms, either directly or through the intermediation of philosophical theory, for the right conduct of our practical life. Intentional psychology is at once more individual and less naive than functional. We may perhaps say that its central task is logically to analyze, to explicate, the operations of perception and thought, as these terms are understood by the average educated person or are received from philosophical tradition; that it extends this procedure of logical analysis to emotion and will, understood in the same way; and that it seeks finally, with marked individual difference, to base the whole of psychology upon the intentional principle. It is thus, like common sense, an applied logic, though unlike common sense its interest lies more in the logic and less in the results of application. Hence it has a natural affiliation to philosophy, and especially to theory of knowledge or pure logic. Since, however, it is not itself pure logic, but rather a logical account of 'psychical phenomena,' it stands also in close relation to the particular technologies of mind, and especially to education.¹⁶¹

We see, then, that these 'psychologies of consciousness,' in order to maintain a logical continuity with philosophy above and everyday practice below, sever psychology from the other sciences, and redefine 'science' to suit their case. We can understand how philosophy, while wholly unconscious of bias, should look with favor upon such systems and with disfavor or indifference upon a truly scientific psychology. We can understand, too, how it comes about that current philosophy should have much to say concerning psychology, and but little to say of physics and chemistry. We can understand that psychiatrists and educators, eager to turn psychology to practical ends, should appeal to systems that are already technological and should look impatiently away from the bare impersonal facts

¹⁶¹I am here characterizing technology *a potiori*, by reference to the pure science upon which it preponderantly draws. In strictness such characterization is not permissible.

of an existential science.¹⁶² All this we can understand, and understanding takes off the bitter edge of controversy. But we see, on the other hand, that physics and chemistry, and of late years biology also, are going their theoretical way without looking aside either to philosophy or to application. We see that they are achieving results of which philosophy must, in the long run, take account; and we see that these results are at once finding technical application. All this, therefore, is ground of encouragement to the votary of a strictly scientific psychology. And if our negative criticism is valid, then the feeling of encouragement becomes an imperative 'experience of claim.' Psychology fairly challenges us to attempt its systematic exposition on an existential basis.

¹⁶²The appeal is intelligible in the light of history and of the historically conditioned education that these technologists receive. Yet it is worth remembering that there is no general technology of physics or chemistry or biology, to mediate between the sciences and their special technologies, the special branches of engineering and medicine. Remote and aloof from everyday life as the laboratories are, their results are taken up into practice at first hand. It is worth remembering too that, despite all the psychological systems from Aristotle down, it is only since the appearance of experimental psychology and its attainment of impersonal results that the special technologies of mind have sprung into vigorous being. Cf. G. E. Müller, *Zur Analyse der Gedächtnistätigkeit und des Vorstellungsverlaufes*, I., 1911, 147; H. Münsterberg, *Psychology and Social Sanity*, 1914, 291 ff.